

The HISTORICAL BULLETIN

A CATHOLIC QUARTERLY
for Teachers and Students of History

Vol. XVI

May • 1938

No. 4

Saint Pius the Fifth

Pedro Leturia

Book Reviews

That Holy Roman Empire

Francis S. Betten

Another Priest in Politics

John B. McGloin

William of Warenne, a Cluny Patron

Herbert H. Coulson

25c a Copy

\$1.00 a Year

SAINT LOUIS UNIVERSITY

SAINT LOUIS, MISSOURI



DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY

Courses in History and Political Science to be
offered during the Summer Session,
June 20 to July 30

HISTORY

Lower Division Courses

Western Europe from the Renaissance to 1830 (3) Dr. Malloy

Western Europe Since 1830 (3) Dr. Malloy

Advanced Courses

*American National Government
(3) Prof. Steinbicker

Medieval Economic History (3) Prof. Coulson

The Intellectual History of the
United States (3) Prof. Espinosa

*History of Present Day Govern-
ments (3) Prof. Steinbicker

The French Revolution and Na-
poleon (3) Prof. Corrigan

The Catholic Church in the United
States (3) Prof. Kenny

Graduate Courses

Studies in English History (2) Prof. Coulson

Historiography in North America
(2) Prof. Espinosa

*Also credited in Political Science

For Summer Bulletin, write

DIRECTOR OF THE SUMMER SESSION

Medievalists!

Trace the genesis
of a
mighty line!

"Great Scholastic Thinkers"

a symposium
for
May

THE MODERN SCHOOLMAN

St. Louis University St. Louis, Mo.

25c per copy

\$1.00 per year

Featured for

TEACHERS OF HISTORY during the 1938 Summer Session



★ The Department of History of St. Louis University will offer a series of conferences on Medieval Culture, The Modern World, Problems of the Present, American Historiography, The Religious Element in History.

★ These conferences are open to all registered students without fee.

★ A similar series in other departments.

★ The Summer Program is strikingly rich in Educational offerings.



For Summer Bulletin, write

DIRECTOR OF THE SUMMER SESSION

The HISTORICAL BULLETIN

A CATHOLIC QUARTERLY
for Teachers and Students of History

Published quarterly in November, January, March and May by the Missouri Province Educational Institute, St. Louis University, St. Louis, Mo. Price: 25c a copy; \$1.00 a year. Entered as second-class matter January 7, 1932, at the Post Office at St. Louis, Mo., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on January 20, 1933.

VOL. XVI

MAY, 1938

No. 4

Table of Contents

SAINT PIUS THE FIFTH	PEDRO LETURIA	63
ANOTHER PRIEST IN POLITICS	JOHN B. MCGLOIN	65
EDITORIALS		67
THAT HOLY ROMAN EMPIRE	FRANCIS BETTEN	69
WILLIAM OF WARENNE, A CLUNY PATRON	HERBERT H. COULSON	75
BOOK REVIEWS		77

THE HISTORICAL BULLETIN is indexed in the Catholic Magazine Index of *The Catholic Bookman*

Saint Pius the Fifth

Pedro Leturia

Gregorian University

Translated by W. Patrick Donnelly

Editor's Note—In the first installment of this scholarly article on the only canonized pope of modern times, an article which incidentally is the longest the BULLETIN has ever published, Father Leturia discusses the two great sources of danger, Constantinople and Geneva, which threatened the Church in 1565. He then reviews three of the four aids on which the pope could depend: the reformed Italian clergy, Catholic Spain and Portugal, and the religious orders. In this second part, he continues with Council of Trent, the holiness and reforming activity of Pius V, his defense of the Church against Calvinism and the crusade of Lepanto. He concludes with a reflection at the tomb of the Saint, which symbolizes his life and work.

A fourth aid, of the utmost importance, was also at the service of the new Dominican Pope in his work of restoration. This was the dogmatic definitions of belief and the program of reform which had been drawn up by the recently adjourned *Council of Trent*. Pope Pius IV had solemnly confirmed the work of the Council of Trent in his bull of June 30, 1564. With the exception of France, the principal Christian States had promulgated the bull in their respective territories during that same year of 1564.²⁵ And Philip II was striving to bring his influence to bear on France to have it promulgated in that country also.²⁶

The Council of Trent was of inestimable service to Saint Pius V. Not only was Pius V completely free from the gruesome spectre of "Councilarism" that had so frequently haunted the Curia from the days of Clement VII to those of Pius IV,²⁷ but the Council had solemnly confirmed the *de jure* and *de facto* supremacy of the Apostolic See. Moreover the Council of Trent had offered the Holy See a definite program for the carrying

out of the work of restoration. Even the institutions that the Council of Trent had suggested for the execution of the reforming program had already been put into operation in Rome by Saint Charles Borromeo during the two years that preceded the opening of the Conclave of 1565-1566.²⁸

It should be manifest, by this time, that the four historical units or aids which we have described, offer us the basis or framework for the intelligent understanding of Pius V's work of restoration. To a considerable extent they explain most of the characteristics of Pius V's restoration, indicate some of the difficulties he had to face, and point out the reasons for his ultimate success. However, before we pass on to an examination of the achievements of Saint Pius the Fifth, we shall pause to take a look at the preeminent character of the Pope himself.

3. Standing out more prominently than any other of the qualities of the Pontiff, was his *personal holiness*. In some fields of ecclesiastical organization and political insight, Pius V is overshadowed by his successor Gregory XIII. For Gregory possessed a keener understanding and grasp of the general European situation in its relations to England and France. Besides, Gregory XIII fostered more directly than did Pius the Fifth the primary education of youth, and was more easily inclined to suspend (despite the fact that he was a lawyer by profession) certain technical and monastic canons that were not suited to the needs of the time. But in sanctity Pius the Fifth surpassed Gregory XIII; as he likewise excelled the genial Pope Sixtus V who continued the policies inaugurated by Pius the Fifth and Gregory XIII. Canonized with the joy of the entire Catholic World, Pius V

²⁵ Cf. Pastor, VII, *Pius IV*, pp. 361-362.

²⁶ Cf. proofs in Dom Luciano Serrano, O. S. B., *Correspondencia diplomática entre España y la Santa Sede durante el Pontificado de S. Pío V*, II (Madrid, 1914), pp. 150, 181.

²⁷ Cf. Outram Evennett, *The Cardinal of Lorraine and the Council of Trent* (Cambridge, 1930), pp. 76 ff.

²⁸ Cf. Pastor, VII, pp. 288 ff.

is the last Pontiff to be raised to the supreme altars of the Church.²⁹

Perhaps it is worth pointing out that Pius the Fifth was not only a thoroughly austere saint in every sense of the word, but a saint whom austerity had made kindly and appealing. Anent this fact, a comparison of Pius the Fifth with Adrian VI is enlightening. This holy and austere Fleming, Pope Adrian VI, came to Rome in 1522 bringing with him the full fruition of the *devotio moderna* in the example of his virtue, and in his sincere zeal to put an end to the scandals of the Renaissance Curia. However, his colorless and extremely frigid manner in dealing with people defeated his good intentions and doomed his efforts to failure. The inscription placed over his tomb was sadly exact—"What a pity that the circumstances in which we live should possess the strength to thwart the virtuous efforts of the very best of men."³⁰

While it is true that Pius the Fifth, as a saint, surpassed Adrian VI in holiness, yet it is also true that the period in which he lived offered far less difficulties than the decade of the 20's, prior to the "Sack of Rome", when Adrian VI governed the Apostolic See. However, we should not overlook the fact that, in the beginning of his Pontificate, the Dominican Pope was also cordially disliked and feared. Because of his penitential life as a Friar, and by reason of the vigilance he displayed at the head of the Roman Inquisition, Pius the Fifth had been dubbed with such sobriquets as the "War Club" and the "Wielder of the Big Stick". This fact is confirmed by the statement of the Spanish envoy, Don Luis de Requesens in 1568: "His Holiness was hated by the court because the court dreaded his rigorism."³¹

Despite the dislike that was felt toward him in the beginning of his Pontificate, Pius the Fifth succeeded in ultimately winning over the Curia, the foreign ambassadors, and even the Roman people. The Pope's life and manner of acting were responsible for the change of attitude toward him. He went barefoot and hatless through the streets of Rome to visit the churches of the city, frequently engaging zealously in work for souls and shedding tears of devotion. The Cardinals were regarded as brothers by Pius the Fifth. And although he was Pope, Pius the Fifth preferred his old cell at Santa Sabina's to the stanze of Raphael. He refused to decorate his family and relations with noble titles. That he might be able to succor the poor more generously, or send financial help to the unfortunate Mary Stuart, worldly festivities were dropped and the strictest economy enforced in the Papal household. And although he lacked diplomatic skill in the handling of political affairs, nevertheless the Pontiff succeeded in smoothing over the difficulties and petty jealousies of rival ambassadors to such an extent that he was able to assemble an international armada which, together with the penances and remarkable faith of the Pope, triumphed over the Turks in the battle of Lepanto. As a result of all these things Pius the Fifth ultimately won over the heart of the fickle Roman populace, who applauded him during the last two years of his

Pontificate with the same enthusiasm that they had hailed the Popes of fifty years before when they were provided with civic celebrations and entertainments.³²

Yet it would certainly be an exaggeration to imagine that Pius the Fifth converted Rome into a religious community or monastery, as has been sometimes suggested with more than a slight touch of irony. Though certain prescriptions of the Pope in regard to the sailors and troops going to Lepanto would seem to suggest such a situation: "Counsels," wrote Requesens, "that His Holiness should have given to his friars when he was Prior at Viguevana, though it would have been well, could they have been enforced in the galleys and elsewhere."³³ Still if Rome was not transformed into a vast monastery, the city at least began to grasp the meaning of what St. Ignatius had meant when he set down three requirements for the restoration of the Church and the world. "Three requirements are necessary and will amply suffice for any Pope to reform the world, reform of the Pope's personal life, reform of his household, and the reform of the court and city of Rome."³⁴

These changes for the better were all the more admirable, since they were wrought by a Pope who maintained undiminished the lofty conception of the "Plenitude of Power" of the Roman Pontiff, as well as his right to intervene in politico-religious questions with the same constancy and determination that had been exemplified in Pope Paul IV. However, this stand did not produce in the Catholic kings or people the distrust of his person which had been generally the result in the case of other Popes. And more than once Pius V achieved remarkable results. Such, for example, was the persuasive influence that the saintly Pius the Fifth exercised over Philip II, that that monarch finally consented to the transfer of Archbishop Carranza to Rome to stand trial for charges of heresy there rather than in Spain.³⁵ Moreover the Pope's absolute disinterestedness and prudence in dealing with his relations provided one of the strongest reasons for the increase of the papal prestige among French Catholics. On noting this attitude, the Venetian ambassador Correro observed that even the Huguenots came to the conclusion that there was nothing in the life of Pius the Fifth that offered an occasion for attacking him, and that beyond all doubt the Pope transacted affairs in such a way as to place himself beyond suspicion.³⁶

In subsequent history, as well as during his own life time, the personal holiness of Saint Pius the Fifth stands out as the greatest achievement of his restoration. It was also due to his sanctity that *permanent institutions of reform* were established which have continued to contribute to the well-being of the Church down to our own day.

Monuments to the achievements of Pius the Fifth in the realm of *Catholic doctrine* are two-fold. First, the solemn elevation, on April 11, 1567, of St. Thomas Aquinas as a Doctor of the Universal Church and the

³² Pastor, VIII pp. 40-49, 612-613 *et passim*.

³³ Text in Dom Luciano Serrano, O. S. B., *España en Lepanto* (Barcelona, 1935), p. 100.

³⁴ Cf. *MHSI*, I (Matriti, 1904), p. 199. "Scripta de S. Ignatio."

³⁵ Cf. texts in Serrano, *Correspondencia* . . . , II pp. xv-xvi.

³⁶ Texts in Pastor VIII, p. 389.

(Turn to page seventy)

²⁹ Cf. Schnürer, *Kathol. Kirche . . . im Barockzeit* p. 58.

³⁰ Pastor, IV/2, p. 149.

³¹ Text in Serrano *op. cit.*, II p. 514, and Schnürer *op. cit.*, p. 57.

Another Priest in Politics

John B. McGloin

San Francisco University

A PREVIOUS article in the BULLETIN discussed the diplomatic career of John Joseph Hughes, Archbishop of New York, who was sent to the papal court of Pius IX by Secretary Seward of Civil War fame. Documentary evidence was cited to prove that the prelate, although dabbling in what some would call partisan politics, while others, it is true, would call it diplomacy, was actuated by the highest and noblest motives.

This study will concern itself with a like diplomatic career entered upon by another high prelate of the Catholic Church who, although a member of the same hierarchy as Hughes, wished nothing more ardently than the defeat of the latter's mission at Rome and the consequent success of his own. This prelate was Patrick Lynch, third occupant of the see of Charleston, South Carolina, an episcopate rendered illustrious at its establishment by its first occupant, John England.

Available sources serve to furnish us with a somewhat prepossessing and favorable picture of Bishop Lynch. Gifted with learning and sacred eloquence, he was a zealous shepherd of souls and a pioneer priest whose sacerdotal career would seem to justify the esteem in which he is held.¹ This article, however, concerns itself not with Patrick Lynch the bishop, but with Lynch, the duly accredited commissioner to Rome of the Confederate States of America. Let us endeavor to trace his diplomatic life.

Lynch must surely have been witness of the bombardment of Fort Sumter, off his episcopal city of Charleston, on April 12, 1861. He must also have manifested keen interest in the surrender of April 14, when Major Anderson handed over his sword to General Beauregard. In fact, judging by the unequivocal partisanship of his later days, Charleston's prelate must not have been in doubt as to the justice of the South's cause. Kin to the priest-poet Abram Ryan in a common priesthood and love for the South, Lynch showed himself a zealous auxiliary in what he no doubt regarded as a holy war for the liberation of the South from domineering and unjust rule.

Because of his indubitable loyalty to the cause of the Confederate States, Bishop Lynch was appointed Confederate Commissioner to the States of the Church in the spring of 1864. Says Dr. Leo Stock of the appointment: "Combining the advantages of ecclesiastical and political position, his appointment was thought to offer unusual opportunities of molding foreign public opinion at Paris, Madrid, Vienna and Rome."²

What were the Bishop's personal reactions to the suggestion that he go abroad in the interests of the Confederacy? These may be gauged from the following letter sent by him on March 3, 1864, to J. P. Benjamin, the Confederate Secretary of State. It is penned from Montgomery Springs, Alabama, and reads as follows:

Sir:

The proposition which you made to me, that I should go to Rome as Commissioner of the Confederate States to the Holy

See, has demanded my most serious consideration.

After mature reflection, I conceive it to be my duty to accede to the desire of the Government, and to accept the position.

I do it with the understanding that I will not be required to prolong my stay in Europe beyond six months; and in case, which I do not now anticipate, urgent reasons should require it, the Government will consent to my return at an earlier period.

In accepting this position, I yield my personal feelings to a sense of duty. Should it appear to you that the public interests would be as well or better served by the appointment of another, it will give me personally much pleasure to be relieved of a duty which I feel to be very responsible, and for which no previous training has prepared me.

I will require three weeks to arrange my ecclesiastical and personal affairs in view of an absence which may possibly be very protracted. I will lose no time and shall endeavor to be in Richmond next week, when I will do myself the honor of paying my respects in person.

Your obt. humble servant,
P. N. Lynch, D. D.
Bishop of Charleston³

Of especial importance are these words of the above quoted letter: "After mature reflection, I conceive it to be my duty to accede to the desire of the Government, and to accept the position." Here the historian is confronted with the intriguing anomaly of two Catholic prelates, Hughes of New York and Lynch of Charleston, each entering the diplomatic arena to undo the work of the other. Lynch had his heart set on the papal endorsement of the Confederate cause, while his brother in the episcopate was just as determined to prevent any papal recognition of what he dubbed "the so-called Confederacy." Such are the exigencies of diplomacy! One wonders if the Church was helped by such manifest division and opposite planning.

Laden with instructions to press for papal recognition of the Confederacy, if that seemed possible—otherwise to maintain such informal relations as might prove fruitful,—Charleston's Bishop began his trek Romewards. It was an unusual mission that was bringing this prelate "ad limina Summi Pontificis"—to the threshold of the Fisherman.

Lynch's first pause was made at Halifax, where he was feted by Archbishop Connelly and dined by sympathizers with the Southern cause. Next he journeyed to Ireland, where he was met by Fr. John Bannon, a secular priest from St. Louis, who had preceded the Bishop to Europe in an endeavor to prevent the wholesale Irish emigration to the northern parts of the United States—where so many Irishmen became union sympathizers and offered themselves as soldiers of the North. Fr. Bannon accompanied Bishop Lynch to Rome in the capacity of chaplain. En route the prelate was careful to pay his respects to the French Emperor in Paris. Robed as a bishop—he felt sure of a more gracious and favorable interview by so clothing himself—Lynch had his audience with Napoleon III, who was shrewd enough to utter only evasive remarks suggestive of a merely passive sympathy with the suffering South.

Arriving in Rome at the beginning of July, 1864, Lynch, though perhaps unaware of it, immediately began

¹ *Catholic Builders of the Nation*, V. 33-34

² *Catholic Historical Review*, XVI, 17-18, seq.

³ *American Catholic Historical Researches* (July, 1905), 248-249.

to figure in the diplomatic correspondence of the United States. For on July 30, 1864, we find Rufus King, United States Minister to the Papal Court, writing as follows to his superior, Secretary Seward:

Bishop Lynch of Charleston, South Carolina, a supporter, if not an accredited agent, of the so-called Confederate Government, has been in Rome for several weeks past. He has not, however, met with any official recognition from the papal authorities nor from what I can learn, is he likely to do so.⁴

From the point of view of the valiant South, it is sad to relate that all of Bishop Lynch's Roman negotiations were fruitless. Although he had interviews with Cardinal Antonelli, Papal Secretary of State, and was more than once closeted with Pius IX, his cause was given neither recognition nor encouragement. In fact, the astute Antonelli went so far as to inform King that the "Bishop was only known in Rome in his clerical capacity, and that, though they had met several times, no reference whatever had been made to political affairs."⁵ Confirming this, Dr. Stock states that "he (Lynch) . . . was received at the Vatican only in his episcopal position—never as an accredited representative of Davis or the Confederacy."

Insult was added to injury by the fact,—perhaps mercifully unknown by Lynch—that his presence in Rome was never considered a threat by the Union emissaries there. In a tone of quiet assurance, King informs Seward in one of his dispatches:

"For the present, at least, I think that there is no likelihood of any recognition, open or secret, of the Southern insurgents."⁶

What were Bishop Lynch's chief occupations while in Rome—besides arranging for as many visits as possible with Pius and Antonelli? The ever-watchful King again affords us an insight into the prelate's activities. He tells Seward that Lynch "entertains a great deal . . . by way of creating a public opinion in favor of the South. But—and the telling is as hard as the circumstances must have been embarrassing for the prelate,—King mercilessly continues: "The supplies, I suspect, have given out, and the Bishop . . . is now a guest of the Propaganda and without visible means of support."⁷

At length, as news of successive Southern losses reached him, Bishop Lynch was persuaded of the hopelessness of the cause he had been sent to represent. King is again our informer: "Bishop Lynch, of Charleston, South Carolina, who has been here for some months past, in the reputed capacity of a Confederate agent, is about to leave Rome. He has met with no official recognition here, and, as I am reliably informed, has said to persons in his confidence, that the re-election of Mr. Lincoln would prove the death-blow of the so-called Confederacy."⁸

Just as the drowning man is said to grasp at the traditional straw, so Lynch was determined to go down fighting—and to grasp any hope of success which might present itself. Indeed, as late as March, 1865, King's diplomatic correspondence informs us that the bishop and his sympathizers profess confident hopes of some

European demonstration on behalf of the so-called Confederate States on, or immediately after, the fourth of March. King added that he entertained no apprehensions on the subject, as "Europe has enough to do at home, while the United States of America have abundantly proved that they can take care of themselves, and neither ask, nor fear, any foreign intervention."⁹

It was at this time that Bishop Lynch began to grow apprehensive about his return to his country and episcopal charge. Mindful of "Vae Victis," he was worried lest his political activity on behalf of the Confederacy might result in his expatriation at the hands of the victorious North. All this we learn from a confidential dispatch of King:

"Bishop Lynch of Charleston, South Carolina, late Confederate Agent, is still here. I had an interview with him, at his request, a short time since. He admitted that the cause of the South was helpless, expressed a wish to return to his home and post of duty, and asked on what terms he could be re-admitted to the United States. I told him that the first thing to be done was to take the oath of allegiance and make his peace with the Federal Government. This he was ready and willing to do, if that would suffice, but he seemed apprehensive that if he returned to America, he might be proceeded against criminally. I told him that the President's proclamation, which was daily expected, would no doubt contain full information on this point. The proclamation has since arrived, and Bishop Lynch, I understand, considers himself included in the list of exceptions. His present purpose, as I learn from a mutual friend, is to proceed to Havana, and thence make his appeal to the Federal authorities. I judge that he is effectually cured of his secession folly."¹⁰

The outcome of it all seems to have been a happy one—at least, inasmuch as Lynch was allowed to return home to his ruined see of Charleston. The Civil War had devastated his diocese, and his cathedral lay prostrate. No mere politician would have proved equal to the herculean task of reconstruction, and the fact that Bishop Lynch labored for seventeen years—up until his death, in fact, which occurred in 1877—to repair the ravages of internecine strife, speaks well for his sacerdotal character—and for his essential sincerity, a quality which, as we may well believe, extended itself also to his diplomatic mission abroad.

Now to draw some conclusion. Lynch's mistake, and it is the writer's opinion that ecclesiastical diplomacy of the nature described in this article is generally a mistake, consisted in his failure to realize what Antonelli had told John P. Stockton, also an American Minister at Rome during the war: "American Catholics will take no part in this war as Catholics—as citizens, however, they will all feel great concern in their country's internal dissensions."¹¹

When Bishop Lynch attempted to make use of his clerical and episcopal position to further the cause of a secular "government"—in this case, the Confederacy—it is the present writer's conviction that he erred—and exposed the American Church to charges of insidious partisanship which can never be aught but ugly in their implications. In fact, it would appear that the prelate was urged on by an unrestrained and emotionally surcharged patriotism which, while quite sincere, was nevertheless productive of an impudence of action that appears both unfortunate and unwise.

⁴ Leo F. Stock, *United States Ministers to Papal States*, p. 313.

⁵ *Diplomatic Correspondence of United States*, King to Seward, Aug. 16, 1864.

⁶ *Ibid.* King to Seward, Aug. 24, 1864.

⁷ Stock, *Op. cit.*, xxxvii-xxxviii.

⁸ *Diplomatic Correspondence*, King to Seward, Oct. 25, 1864.

⁹ *Ibid.*, King to Seward, Oct. 25, 1864.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, King to Seward, June 24, 1865.

¹¹ *Catholic Historical Review*, XVI, 18.

The HISTORICAL BULLETIN

A CATHOLIC QUARTERLY
for Teachers and Students of History

RAYMOND CORRIGAN, *Editor*

Staff

GREGORY C. HUGER	CHARLES L. SANDERSON
PHILIP T. DERRIG	EDWARD R. VOLLMAR
BRIAN A. MCGRATH	HAROLD J. MCAULIFFE
W. BARBY FAHERTY	MARTIN F. HASTING



Advisory Board

MARTIN J. HARNEY	FRANCIS S. BETTEN
Boston College	Marquette University
THOMAS F. MAHER	W. PATRICK DONNELLY
Gonzaga University	Spring Hill College
CHARLES H. METZGER	PETER M. DUNNE
West Baden College	University of San Francisco
LAURENCE K. PATTERSON	
Woodstock College	

GEORGE J. MCHUGH, *Business Manager*

Address communications to The Historical Bulletin, St. Louis University, St. Louis, Mo.

EDITORIALS

Stimulating History

There are millions of people in New York who have never seen the foundations of the Empire State Building. Among the tourists who watched its gigantic mass mount heavenward and admired the daring and skill with which block upon block was piled, few if any paused to calculate the importance of the underground structure. For all they cared, the architect might have neglected everything below the main floor. The comparison may sound far-fetched. But the architect of Progress who ignores the legacy of Tradition is in somewhat the same case with the builder who has nothing to build upon. Modern civilization without its medieval, and incidentally Christian, background is unthinkable. The present heights have been reached only by taking our stand on the solid achievements of the past. Neglect or contempt for the past is comparable to the modern lack of intellectual curiosity for whatever lies beyond or behind the visible and tangible. A wholesome antidote for this obtuseness will be found in Ross Hoffman's *Tradition and Progress*.*

In the things of sense there has been remarkable progress. Invariably, the overworked word calls to mind the triumphs of the machine age, success in the struggle for a comfortable existence, the amassing of material aids to bodily well-being. Tradition, on the other hand, is rich in ideas, ideals and institutions that refine and ennoble the mind of man. It is still possible, though difficult, to cling to the spiritual creations of the past and at the same time to enjoy the goods the gods of industry and trade provide us. The danger lies not in a conflict between tradition and progress, but rather in the exhausting of available energy in the pursuit of material things with the consequent atrophying of spiritual faculties. The philosopher-historian is at hand to warn, and to offer an obvious remedy for the unbalanced modern mind. Philosophy has been called the science of the totality of things. History strives to reveal the totality of man's past perversity and failure, endeavor and achievement. Practically, the philosopher and the historian share in the same noble function of guiding humanity to the fullest earthly

life. Either offers the safeguard of an adequate perspective of reality which counteracts the tendency to concentrate limited powers on partial truths.

We have wandered from an original purpose of recommending Professor Hoffman's stimulating essays to our readers. Much of what the book contains will be familiar to many of us. But there is more in these twelve chapters than could be gotten out of the scattered articles which the author here reproduces along with much supplementary matter. From his opening discussion of tradition and progress, through his gentle blasting of freak ideas like the "as if" history of recent reformers, his decorous satisfaction at the passing of a moribund Liberalism and his properly qualified admiration for an aggressive and misguided Marxism, to his final hopeful discerning of a new dawn for the irrepressible Church, he tears away the clumsy supports of bad history and lays bear the inner strength of the only kind of history that has a meaning.

Passing over the author's very able defense of property as the basis of liberty, of the individual against the totalitarian state in its various forms, of the capacity of the human mind to know against the protagonists of positivism, and with a mere allusion to his manifest insight into the power and weaknesses of writers like Berdyaev, Belloc and Crane Brinton, we turn to a brief chapter on "Marxist History and Liberalism," which happens to interest us at the moment.

In the historical field the Marxist is superior to the Liberal. He will write bad history, but he recognizes the importance of history. He will distort facts to fit his materialist interpretation, but he is not indifferent to facts. He possesses an historical sense, and in his way he tries to grasp the whole of humanity's past. Before his attack the flimsy constructions of the Rationalist-Positivist-Liberal collapse. He does not make the mistake of totally ignoring the spiritual element in western civilization. His faith in the Marxian dogma of Dialectic Materialism is so strong that he undertakes to explain religion and culture as well as government, law or business in terms of economics. His insane hypothesis is often fruitful in the uncovering of new truths, especially in the social order of the past.

* *Tradition and Progress*, by Ross Hoffman. Milwaukee. Bruce. 1938. pp. xiii and 165. \$2.00.

But we are chiefly interested in the stimulating effect upon saner historians of the demoniac energy displayed by the Marxians. In the service of a bad cause they dig deep into the past. May we not hope that their quest will bring to light the total truth which must destroy their utopian system? In any case, like heretics in other times they are forcing the defenders of truth to clarify many an obscure recess in the past. An alert Christianity need not worry about the Marxian historical attack, and Christians may rest secure in the thought that they alone can face the past as they alone can face the future. But the unholy zeal of the Marxist should stir and stimulate the Catholic scholar to greater activity. A somnolent indifference to the search for the meaning of history is less excusable now than ever before.

Critics of Democracy

Two short decades ago we launched a crusade to make the world safe for Democracy. Less than a decade ago twenty-five million Americans voted a champion of "Rugged Individualism" into continued residence in the White House. After the War a cynical Europe wondered at our naive and persistent idealism. Up to the Depression we thought (or did we really *think*?) that all the noisy catchwords of the nineteenth century contained the very essence of life. Democracy, Science, Education were justified by their palpable and quite palatable fruits. The din and whirl of the dizzy decade made us deaf to every warning. As we "chased the glowing hours with flying feet" we were scarcely conscious of any criticism of the good things we had inherited from the age of Liberal, Industrial, Capitalist Materialism. Vague memories should make it easy for us to appreciate the unruffled calm with which self-satisfied Victorians tolerated the critics of Victorian Democracy.*

Then came the great disillusionment. Saddened and sobered by the cracking and crashing of idols with feet of clay we were more ready to lend a bewildered ear to historians and philosophers, as well as to pessimists of various hue, who pointed out the weak spots in what we had imagined to be the best possible world. A re-interpretation of the near past was now in order, and the historian could revel in his new opportunity. But it is not the purpose of this editorial to display an unseemly satisfaction at the discomfiture of those who have had to unlearn Bourgeois dogmas of Progress and material bigness. The world situation is still too serious for that. It must, however, be obvious that a book which discusses the "prophets" of an earlier day is altogether timely.

Professor Lippincott summarizes the attack on "Democracy" of three men of letters, a judge, a lawyer and an historian. He himself is frankly on the side of democracy (with a small "d," we hope). But he gives us a fair exposition of the case against a popular ideal that was once worshipped blindly and is still dear to its desperate defenders. The critics themselves are, of course, open to criticism. If, for example, Carlyle's "strong man enforcing order" is realized in the Nazi Fuehrer; if both Carlyle and Ruskin, and to a lesser degree the other critics, were

forerunners of Socialism, our admiration for them must be tempered by reservations. The fact is, there is little of positive value in any of the Victorians here studied. In each of them there was a warped philosophy of life. But they do deserve credit for castigating abuses and pointing out dangers in the dominant trends of the age in which they wrote.

Certainly, there was reason to cry out against social disintegration, the rule of ignorance and the impoverishing of culture, against the apotheosis of mediocrity, "the materialism of the upper classes, the vulgarity of the middle classes and the brutality of the lower classes," against the "do nothing state" of the Liberals which was impotent to solve the social question. There were grounds for the charge that the masses were ignorant, incompetent, utterly indifferent, venal and selfish. Ruskin and Carlyle were right in demanding aristocracy in government, honesty, responsibility and a care for decent living conditions. But partial truth, even when expressed in sublime phrases, was powerless to make a better world, or to safeguard a secularized civilization from the mistakes by which alone it was capable of learning. The critics thought they were "wandering between two worlds, one dead, the other powerless to be born." Traditional prejudice blinded them to the continued existence of a still vital Kingdom of God which the modern man chose to forget or ignore.

The inadequacy of Humanitarianism and of Puritanism to furnish a rational basis for social reform is set forth clearly enough by Professor Lippincott. A feeling of pity for one's inferiors remains within the realm of emotion. Even when accompanied by a philanthropic disposition to alleviate suffering it may serve chiefly to "fortify the conscience" of the well-to-do against a sense of social obligation. Humanitarianism had a strong appeal in the past century, and it did produce some good effects. But it was often a gushy thing, the mere shrinking of an earth-bound society from physical pain. It was a poor substitute for Christian charity or, more exactly, for religion which had been denatured and rather generally disowned. But the point to insist upon here is that it "closed the minds" of the prosperous and self-righteous Middle Class to the charge of exploitation and materialism. The Humanitarianism of able writers might thrill a few sincere souls, but it rendered them only the more deaf to the claims of social justice. A new privileged class was quite willing on occasion to pay a price for comfortable security.

At least equally potent in fortifying the Bourgeois conscience was Puritanism. The descendants of the "elect of the Lord" clung to their feeling of superiority long after they had abandoned the God of their fanatical forebears. There was a moral strength in the Puritan that made for his success in the great game of amassing money. On the other hand, the rapid dwindling of the religious element in the legacy of Calvin in no way impaired his deep conviction that he should possess the earth. The rugged force of writers who had inherited the Puritan ethic was powerful to stir the emotions. But neither the writers nor the rich men who read their works could remedy the patent injustices that flourished under

(Turn to page seventy)

**Victorian Critics of Democracy: Carlyle, Ruskin, Arnold, Stephen, Maine, Lecky*, by Benjamin Evans Lippincott. University of Minnesota Press. Minneapolis. 1938. pp. ix and 276. \$3.75.

That Holy Roman Empire

Francis S. Betten

Marquette University

THE Holy Roman Empire, the greatest of the peculiar medieval institutions, is often misunderstood by students and lovers of history. The following random notes are presented to clear up some of the questions which arise in connection with it.

No prince could become Emperor except by receiving the imperial crown from the hands of the Pope. The regular place of the coronation was the Basilica of St. Peter in Rome, though some coronations did take place elsewhere. No prince ever styled himself Emperor before the Pope had actually put the imperial diadem upon his head. Before that solemn act the prince was designated "Roman King," or "King of the Romans," a title which however in no way indicated that he had any political power over the city of the Popes or their temporal possessions. These titles had become customary about 1100, having been used before that time only sporadically.

The first Emperor of the Holy Roman Empire was Charles the Great (Charlemagne), King of the Franks, crowned by Leo III on Christmas day of the year 800. After him for two centuries the popes bestowed the crown on descendants of Charles or such other rulers as were in some way connected with his family. Often they were kings of rather small kingdoms. The last Emperor of this group, Berengar, King of northern Italy, died in 924.

In 962 the German King, Otto I the Great, was crowned Emperor in Rome, and after that event there was an unwritten law, that only rulers of Germany would be raised to that dignity. Hence the title, "The Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation." The pope always respected this privilege of the Germans. But it gave him a right concerning the German kingship which he did not have concerning other potentates. Since it was he who bestowed the imperial dignity, it was his right and duty to see that the man presented by the Germans was really worthy and fit to hold that important position. This power became actual when in 1198 the Germans split into two parties, each of which presented its candidate for the imperial coronation.

The crowning of the Emperor by the Pope was essentially different from the coronations bestowed in nearly all kingdoms upon a new ruler by an archbishop or primate of the realm. A royal coronation did not *make* the king. He possessed his power before it. He had become king by the death of his predecessor or by an election of the magnates of the kingdom. The coronation was meant to be a religious sanction of his accession to the throne and a solemn prayer and blessing for his reign. The imperial coronation on the contrary really *made the Emperor*.

By the coronation the Emperor became as it were the firstborn son of the Church. In meetings with other princes he was given the place of honor, and the same privilege was accorded to his ambassadors when meeting with those of other potentates. The Emperor was publicly prayed for. We still see in our official missals the

special prayers for him, especially the prayer once sung or read on Good Friday. The Emperor was the professed defender of the Church and all her interests, and in particular of the Papacy and its possessions.

There could be only one Emperor, just as there was but one Pope. The presence of the Eastern Emperor at Constantinople whose power did not extend into the West of Europe, was not felt as a limitation; and later, when (in 1054) these Greek Emperors had fallen away from the Catholic Church, their title could no longer come into consideration. It was only after 1800 that other rulers of Christian lands adopted the title of Emperor.

The bestowal of the imperial dignity by the coronation did not give any political power or jurisdiction to the new Emperor. It did not add a square foot to his dominions. It did not make him the Lord of Rome or the Papal States, which remained entirely under papal government. Nor did it give him any jurisdiction over the other independent states. It was only in the defense of the Church and her interests that, in theory at least, the Emperor might call on other rulers for assistance.

His dignity was mainly in the sphere of the ideal. He was the secular head of the Christian family of nations, and represented in his person the secular unity of the Catholic world. Hence the very idea of the Holy Roman Empire had a deep educating influence upon the peoples. The existence of this dignity was a constant promulgation of the fact that not only in spiritual matters but even in the natural order no state stood alone but all belonged to one great body, the universal Christian Commonwealth of Nations, the *Res publica Christiana*. The Emperor was the living personification of the Brotherhood of Men. Even when there was no crowned Emperor, or when the existing Emperor did not live up to his sacred duties, the idea of what ought to be remained and continued to influence the minds of the people. The imperial dignity was the highest goal a Catholic prince could strive for. "The splendor of all royal crowns faded before the brilliancy of the imperial diadem."

As stated above the German King was styled "*Roman King*" or "*King of the Romans*" before he had received the crown from the Sovereign Pontiff. This custom was very strictly adhered to. No prince ever spoke of himself as "*Emperor*" before his coronation in Rome. A partial change, however, took place in the year 1508. The Roman King of that time, Maximilian I, found it impossible to undertake the journey to Rome on account of the opposition of the Venetians. He therefore petitioned the Pope to permit him to assume the title of "*Emperor Elect*," which the Sovereign Pontiff granted. This title was in reality the same as "*Roman King*," but far more honorable. From that time on every German King asked for and obtained the same privilege. In all official documents these rulers were styled "*Emperor Elect*" (*Imperator Electus*, or *In Imperatorem Electus*),

though in non-official parlance the word "Elect" was commonly omitted. After Maximilian I, only one ruler was actually crowned Emperor by the Pope, namely, Maximilian's grandson, Charles V.

After the introduction of the new title it happened several times that during the incumbency of an Emperor Elect a successor was chosen to follow him in his office. During the Emperor Elect's lifetime he was called "Roman King." Thus Ferdinand, brother of Charles V, figured as "Roman King," until upon the abdication of Charles he himself became Emperor Elect.

The Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation existed until 1806. The Emperors as Kings of Germany saw their domestic power gradually dwindle, while the prestige of the subject German princes constantly increased. The Reformation and the wars and rebellions connected with it, as well as the violent interference of foreign powers, especially France, greatly helped to weaken the unity and cohesion of the German states. It was a blessing for the nation that after 1438 members of the mighty Hapsburg dynasty of Austria had regularly been chosen as Kings, and consequently as bearers of the imperial crown. Finally in the wars of the French Revolution against Germany, which began in 1792, German unity broke down completely, and on August 6, 1806, the reigning Emperor Elect, Francis II, abdicated the crown of the Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation. Thus an institution which was more than a thousand years old passed out of existence, an institution which in a way had formed a link between the ancient Roman world and modern times. Another link, the Papal States, grown organically out of ancient Roman provinces, disappeared in 1870, to be revived on a modest scale in 1929.

Two years before abdicating Emperor Francis II had declared his domestic possessions "the Austrian Empire" and assumed the title "Emperor of Austria." The Austrian Empire, for several decades the most powerful European state, existed until its dismemberment after the World War.

Editorial (continued)

middle class domination. Prophets and critics had no reasoned basis for their arguments. And the rich men were so sure of the sacredness of property and of their own titles to economic power that the less fortunate condition of mere human beings did not perturb them. True, they shared political and civil rights, at least in appearance. But all the while they were tightening the economic grip of Capitalism. Now, that the inner contradictions of the Victorian system are coming to light, voices that once cried in the wilderness can hope for a hearing.

Macmillan has published an *Analytical Survey of Modern European History*, by Paul V. B. Jones. This work book in two parts is designed to facilitate the class room use of Carlton Hayes' *Political and Cultural History of Modern Europe*. We shall always regret that our favorite history text has been improved beyond the Freshman-Sophomore level. This work book may induce wavering instructors to continue its use in the Junior college. Mature students who are majoring in history will know how to treasure the Hayes text.

Saint Pius the Fifth

(Continued from page sixty-four)

most illustrious representative of Catholic theology. And secondly, the condemnation, on the 1st of October, 1567, of Baius' doctrines on grace, which condemnation, if not directly responsible for the checking of Jansenism, at least enunciated the principles that would be later employed in extirpating it. Finally, as became one who was the Shepherd of the Universal Church, Pius the Fifth established, March 27, 1571, the "Congregation of the Index for Forbidden books" which has continued up to the present to guard sedulously the orthodox doctrines of Catholicism.³⁷

The saintly Pontiff also sponsored lasting reform in *catechetics*, in the *sacred ministry*, and in the *liturgy*. By his authorization the "Catechism", so long desired by the Council of Trent, was published in 1566. With unerring Apostolic instinct Pius the Fifth personally supervised the task of having the "Catechism" translated into the vernacular languages of the various nations. In 1568 the new Breviary appeared, and in 1570 the new Missal; in both of which tradition was collected, evaluated, and harmonized with greater clarity and simplicity. Holy Scripture and the Fathers of the East were given their deserved place in the liturgy of the Church. Work was commenced on the clarification of the texts of the liturgy and on the elimination of accretions which critical history and sound humanism had brought to light.³⁸ Finally (passing over many of his other enterprises that have borne lasting fruit) the popularizing of the public veneration of the Blessed Sacrament in confraternities, was due to Pope Pius the Fifth. Imitating a custom that was already fostered by the Spanish King and several other Princes, the Pope established solemn processions to lead the way for the priest carrying Viaticum to the sick or dying.³⁹ Through his efforts the popular devotion to the Rosary was greatly increased. To this form of prayer Saint Pius the Fifth attributed the reform of Christian life among the masses ("in alios viros repente mutari"), the checking and diminution of heresy ("haeresum tenebras remitti"), and the spread and increase of the Catholic Faith ("lucem catholicae fidei aperiri").⁴⁰

The Reformer

It is rather difficult to summarize adequately the Holy Father's energetic and persevering activity in the *successful reform of the clergy, the religious Orders, and the people*. Consequently, we shall be forced to limit ourselves to the mere indication of some of the more important mile-stones in this work. In the first place there was the establishment of more than a hundred diocesan and provincial councils between 1566 and 1572 from Rome and Milan to Goa, Mexico and Lima in Peru.⁴¹ Add to this the successful erection of seminaries in many dioceses, and the continual exhortations of the Pope to

³⁷ Cf. details, *ibid.*, pp. 146, 273, 149 ff.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 141-144.

³⁹ B. Pia a Luzzara 10 julio 1568; *ibid.*, p. 165, note 3.

⁴⁰ Words quoted by Leo XIII in his famous encyclical on the Rosary, "Octobri mense". Cf. Josephus de Guibert, S. J., *Documenta ecclesiastica christianae Perfectionis studium spectantia* (Romae, 1931), p. 364.

⁴¹ Cf. lists in Pastor, VIII, 157-158.

backward Bishops on the importance of establishing seminaries, "than which nothing can be devised more useful or more suited to the needs of the Church at this time"; the insistence, for the most part successful, upon episcopal residence and pastoral visitations of Bishops in their dioceses; theological examinations of the clergy, conferences, and the study of conscience;⁴² the reorganization and restoration of the "Observantine" branches of the older orders and of the Franciscan Conventuals in Italy, Germany and France; the suppression of the "Conventuals" among the Dominicans, as well as among the Franciscans in Spain, Flanders, and Portugal, since the Pope judged, on the testimony of the King and of the Episcopate, that the "Conventuals" in these places were an obstacle to complete reform;⁴³ the protection of the colleges and missions of the Society of Jesus; the lofty and noble use he made of the sanctity and prestige of the Jesuit General, Saint Francis Borgia, despite his persistent antipathy for certain modern innovations in the canonical organization of the Jesuits.⁴⁴ Lastly, there was the heroic persistence and determination with which Pius the Fifth demanded, by word and deed, the independence of the Apostolic See against royalist encroachments, a demand that was directed with equal energy even against such Princes as Philip II, whose cooperation was absolutely essential for the defense, administration and reform of Christendom.⁴⁵

The Foreign Missions

Although in all these enterprises, Pius the Fifth surpassed every one of his predecessors of the sixteenth century, it is only right to observe that his way was cleared and prepared for him in Rome, from the time of Paul III, by Contarini, Caraffa and Saint Ignatius Loyola. But there was one field of pontifical action in particular in which Pius the Fifth's labors are characterized by a pleasing originality. We refer to his tireless exertions in behalf of the *Missions to pagan lands*. The popes had never lost interest in the missions since the discovery of both Indies and the circumnavigation of the globe. These discoveries had opened a new era of evangelizing zeal. But during all of this period, from the Pontificate of Pope Alexander VI to that of Pius IV, the Popes had been constrained to follow almost exclusively a method of indirect activity. This consisted largely in the concession of patronal (often, indeed, ultra-patronal) privileges to the Kings of Spain and Portugal. When they interested themselves in the erection of ecclesiastical hierarchies, or in the correction of abuses that had crept in, this was always at the request of the Spanish and Portuguese Kings, or of Spanish and Portuguese missionaries. Pius the Fifth inaugurated a new comprehensive plan of direct

activity in the work of the mission field.⁴⁶

An occasion presented itself when in 1586 the Grand Council of Madrid drew up plans for the reorganization of the Spanish Viceroyalties in America. In that year Philip II decided to send out two new Viceroys, Henriquez and Toledo, to Mexico and Lima respectively; and Menendez de Avilés was to be sent to Florida as *Adelantado*.

When these proposals of the Spanish King, sanctioned and approved by St. Francis Borgia, were relayed to Rome by the Papal Nuncio Castagna, the Pope determined to match them in the missionary field, with a sincerity and zeal that was typical of this evangelizing son of St. Dominic. Pius the Fifth proposed to establish a Papal Nuncio in America who would act in spiritual matters as his own viceregent. It was only long established tradition (dating back to the days of Ferdinand the Catholic) that ultimately caused the abandonment of this resolution. At any rate the Pontiff proceeded to draw up specific instructions as a guiding norm for missionary work. Copies of these instructions were dispatched to the Spanish King, the Council of the Indies, to Cardinal Espinosa, and to the newly appointed *adelantado* and viceroys. Recalling in tone and content the glorious missionary traditions of the Dominicans, which had been inaugurated under the generalship of Cajetan, Pius the Fifth's prescriptions laid down principles of such practical missionary value that they may be said to constitute the foundations of a new epoch in the missions of Spanish America.⁴⁷ A year earlier, in a brief "Exponi nobis" dated March 20, 1568, he had confirmed the privileges and exemptions of the older Orders in view of their missionary needs and activities, despite the existence of contrary canons set up by the Council of Trent. His far-sighted action in this respect postponed, for many years, the disruptive crises that were to overtake the missions. For the Pope saw clearly that the missions, without the help of the mendicant religious Orders, were doomed to failure.⁴⁸

But the cosmopolitan zeal of the Pope led him even further in the work of the missions. Both at the joint proposal of Saint Francis Borgia, who typified at the moment Spain's missionary spirit, and of Portugal's Ambassador Alvaro de Castro, who symbolized the Portuguese missionary tradition, Pius the Fifth, on May 20, 1568, approved the foundation of a special Roman Congregation which should devote itself to matters pertaining to the conversion of the infidels. Herein can be seen the planting of the seed that was to grow into the future congregation de Propaganda Fide.⁴⁹ In such ways Pius the Fifth brought to fruition in all their varied and manifold aspects the fundamental principles of Catholic restoration, which, we cannot insist too often, had their inception in Italy, Spain and Flanders, before the rise of either Calvin or Luther.

⁴² For details, *ibid.*, 157-158, 154, 158-159.

⁴³ On the reform of the religious Orders in Spain, which had been under way since the time of Cardinal Ximenes, cf. new documents in Serrano, *Correspondencia*, IV, xxviii-1. On the suppression of the Conventual Dominicans under Pius V, cf. Walz, *op. cit.*, 53, 262. For both, cf. Pastor, VIII, 181-189.

⁴⁴ Cf. A. Astrain, *op. cit.*, II, 317 ff.; Pastor, VIII, 203-207 ff. The Pope was displeased especially with two points which had been approved by his predecessors and were later confirmed by his successors: the name, "Company of Jesus," and the arrangement according to which the final profession was not made at the end of the novitiate nor even before the reception of major orders.

⁴⁵ Cf. Serrano, *Correspondencia*, III, v-x1; Pastor, VIII, 279 ff.

⁴⁶ Pedro Leturia, "Felipe II y el Pontificado en un momento culminante de la Historia hispanoamericana," in *Estudios Eclesiásticos*, special number (1928), 61 ff.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, 43 ff., 64-65.

⁴⁸ Pedro Leturia, "El regio Vicariato de Indias y los comienzos de la Congregación de Propaganda Fide" in *Spanische Forschungen der Görresgesellschaft*, 2 (1929), 152 ff.

⁴⁹ Cf. *MHSI*, "Polanci Complementa," II, 688.

The success that attended his work of purifying and revivifying within the Church the whole field of contemporary spiritual life, forms the basis of the second great achievement of the Pontificate of Saint Pius the Fifth.

Defense: Calvinism

The Pontificate of Pius the Fifth is also of great importance by reason of the part the Pope played in the politico-religious defense of Christianity against its two most implacable enemies, as has already been indicated in the beginning of this paper. In the West the foe of the Church was Calvinism, which threatened to draw England, France, Scotland, Flanders, a good part of Switzerland, and Protestant Germany into an alliance against Rome. From the East, the three hundred galleys of Ali-Pasha and Luchali were prepared to launch an attack on Cyprus or Messina.

With these combined dangers in the offing, the English Minister Cecil went so far as to predict the utter disappearance of the Papacy at an early date.⁵⁰ There can be no doubt that the Pope had deep fears of a Huguenot invasion into Italy from the north as well as of a Turkish assault on southern Italy.⁵¹ This dread led him to look on the power and religious faith of Philip II and his Empire as both necessary and providential for the safety of the Church. Pius the Fifth allowed nothing, great or small, to break his determination to rely on Spain. There existed in the Curia an anti-Spanish group which owed its origin to the preceding Paul IV and his veritable phobia in regard to Spain. But neither did this, nor his own frequent and acrimonious controversies with Madrid over questions of mixed jurisdiction or patronage, hold Pius the Fifth back. Nor did the Pope balk at the wearisome personal negotiation in which his own quick, persuasive and decisive judgments contrasted strongly with Philip's slow and extremely cautious prudence. He fully realized that Spain was his only hope. And in this reliance upon Spain there was no indication during the Pontificate of Pius the Fifth (as in the following Pontificates of Gregory XIII and Sixtus V) of a desire to counterbalance the weighty influence of Philip II and the Spanish Church by building up a strong Catholic France.⁵²

The Pope flatly condemned every suggestion of the use of dagger or poison against Condé and Coligny.⁵³ Together with Philip II, he did, however, express his resentment at the shameful religious peace of Longjumeau in 1568 and of St. Germain in 1570. Moreover in the interests of the Church, the Pope opposed the plan of marriage between Henry of Anjou and Elizabeth of England, and that between Margaret of Valois and the Protestant Henry of Navarre.⁵⁴ "His Holiness says [Zúñiga wrote to Philip II on December 10, 1568] that if the King of France refuses to rely on the assistance of your ministers

and your army, he will find it well nigh impossible to extricate himself from the serious dangers that threaten his kingdom."⁵⁵

In regard to the revolt of the Netherlands, the Pope clearly perceived that the rebellion engineered by William of Orange was exploiting, to its own advantage, the general disgust of the Flemish with the Hispanization policies of Philip II. Accordingly, with great energy and persistence, he urged on Philip the desirability of personally visiting those states and adopting milder policies of government. But when the iconoclastic and anti-Eucharistic riots perpetrated in Flanders by French Calvinistic troops came to the knowledge of the Pope, he determined to promote a "Crusade" against them. He personally took part in the processions held at Rome for the success of Alba's expedition to Flanders, and granted the Spanish King taxes and ecclesiastical levies to help support the expedition. Later on Pius the Fifth conferred special distinctions on the victorious Duke of Alba and his wife, and censured the Venetian Ambassador for having attacked the methods of Alba as cruel. Finally when the situation in Flanders seemed vastly improved, the Pontiff even abandoned the unfavorable judgment which at the outset of the crisis he had formed of Philip and his failure to visit Flanders in person.⁵⁶

The satisfaction of the Pope with the turn of affairs in Flanders during 1569 and 1570 provides an essential antecedent to the complete understanding of his bull against Elizabeth of England, dated February 25, 1570.

The Excommunication of Elizabeth

Since 1569 the Pope had been desirous of using Alba's powerful army to overcome Geneva, perceiving, and not without good reason, that that city was the Protestant anti-Rome of Europe.⁵⁷ By the middle of the same year, however, the plan that the Pope had conceived against Geneva had yielded to a second proposal which seemed to promise a larger measure of success, namely a campaign to oppose the Protestant policy that had been adopted by the Queen of England and her Minister Cecil. And in the Pope's proposal to go the assistance of the English Catholics, an entrance into England by way of Flanders was contemplated.

The plan to invade England was originally conceived, as is now well known, neither by the Duke of Alba nor by Philip II, but rather by certain Catholic groups in England itself. When Pius the Fifth first suggested the idea to Alba the Duke responded coldly, and even expressed his opposition to it. He pointed out that any plan for Spain's cooperation with France in such an enterprise was out of the question; and that even if the expedition should be regarded as a conquest by Spain for Philip II, or as a relief expedition to support some English noble who would marry Mary Stuart as Queen of England, the undertaking would, nevertheless, still be impossible because of the financial and military difficulties involved.⁵⁸ Moreover (so the Duke added several months later), the national patriotism of the English would be belligerently

⁵⁰ Text in Pastor, VIII, 379, note 2.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, 369-370 ff.

⁵² Cf. Merriman, *op. cit.*, IV, 55, 61.

⁵³ On May 19, 1568, the ambassador Zúñiga wrote to Philip II: "The Pope has told me with great secrecy that those Kings [of France] wished to do a deed which he could neither approve nor advise, a deed, moreover, which in his opinion could not be done with a clear conscience; . . . since they considered engaging an assassin to kill the Prince of Condé and the Admiral [Coligny]." Serrano, II, 372.

⁵⁴ Cf. Pastor, VIII, 356, 375, 379-382.

⁵⁵ Serrano, *Correspondencia*, III, 35.

⁵⁶ Cf. Pastor, VIII, 351-356; Serrano, *ibid.*, II, xlviii, lxii, lx.

⁵⁷ Documents in Serrano, *ibid.*, II, 95 ff., 102 ff., 479, *et passim*.

⁵⁸ Pastor has thrown light on the details of this affair, Pastor, VIII, 425-427; cf. also Serrano, *ibid.*, III, 91-92.

aroused against any kind of a foreign invasion of their country.⁵⁹

As a matter of fact the Pope's proposal neither called for the participation of France in the endeavor, nor contemplated the conquest of England for the benefit of Philip II. "It has always seemed [to the Pope] quite settled that for the return of England to the Church, it is not expedient that Your Majesty conquer that kingdom for yourself, nor that the French participate in the task. It is altogether sufficient for some Catholic gentlemen in England to marry the Queen of Scotland, whom Your Majesty would then endeavor to have recognized by their kingdom."⁶⁰ These are the words that Zúñiga penned to the King of Spain on April 28, 1570.

Although Alba, Zúñiga and Philip II all continued to hold the opinion that the proposal was impracticable, groups of English Catholics anxiously pleaded with the Pope to settle their only difficulty, namely, the standing of Elizabeth in the eyes of the Church. "They scrupled [Pius the Fifth told Zúñiga] to take up arms against the Queen until the Holy See should have declared Elizabeth a heretic and deprived her of the kingdom."⁶¹ It was for this reason that Saint Pius the Fifth decided to publish the bull of excommunication and deposition against Elizabeth without the knowledge of Philip II or of his ministers at Rome and Brussels. He sincerely believed that, in this way, he was fulfilling an obligation in conscience to the English Catholics. In reply to the retaliatory threats of Queen Elizabeth against his own person, the Pope declared that if he could assuage the wrath of the Queen by the shedding of his own blood, such an act would afford him greater joy than the possession of the Papal dignity.⁶²

When, several months after the publication of the bull in England, Philip II received his initial and unexpected knowledge of the excommunication, he immediately perceived the serious consequences that such a step would entail. In a letter of June 30, 1570, to his ambassador in London, Gureau De Spes, Philip asserted that "in truth His Holiness has taken this action without informing me in any way or communicating with me about it." Philip II was fearful lest this action of the Pope should render the position of the English Catholics worse than before. "The Pope erroneously thinks," said Philip II, "that his own zeal is always a guarantee of success."⁶³ The Spanish King, as likewise both Alba and Zúñiga, strained every nerve to prevent the solemn promulgation of the bull, even after it had been secretly issued in England.⁶⁴ And not more than a year later, the affair was the primary cause of Philip II becoming enmeshed in the conspiracy of Ridolfi that cost the life of the Duke of Norfolk, and seriously compromised the position of Mary Stuart and that of the English Catholics. Even though appearances at the time seemed to warrant a favorable judgment, the Duke of Alba always regarded this Ridolfi as a mere "babbler" and "a dreamer." And Alba said openly that

the attempt "would result in the loss of Mary Stuart's life" without achieving any positive advantage for the Spanish King.⁶⁵ A short time later this prediction, to the letter, was completely verified.

Nevertheless the bull of excommunication against Queen Elizabeth remains one of the most important, as well as one of the most characteristic acts of the Dominican Pope. The bull was issued at the dictates of his conscience because of his sincere and personal concern in the welfare of the English Catholics. The document contained no dogmatic error since it did not proclaim the direct power of the Pope in temporal affairs. Rather the bull can be very well understood to have been issued in virtue of the "indirect" power which the Pope actually possesses over temporal concerns, when these affairs are intimately related to religion and morals.⁶⁶ The imprudence on the part of the Pope which, even at that time, many Catholics opposed, and which subsequent Pontiffs have indirectly acknowledged, centered around two questions. The first is the practicability or advisability of actually deposing Princes in the sixteenth century. Such an action, of course, does not precisely constitute the "indirect power" itself, but is rather one of the modes or methods of exercising the "indirect" power. It was a method whose effectiveness had been successfully demonstrated in earlier centuries, but which was not adapted to the particular circumstances of the sixteenth century. Secondly, the advisability of directing this deposition to the country that was Europe's sore-spot at the moment, and in which political and military experts foresaw that it would be extremely difficult and dangerous to exercise this principle.⁶⁷

Yet, even in this instance, the bull of Pius the Fifth was turned to good account for posterity. For it presented an occasion to the two great post-Tridentine theologians, Saint Robert Bellarmine and Francis Suarez, to demark more clearly the limits of the "indirect power" of the Pope; and to defend the democratic origins of the civil power against the absolutist theories of certain theologians and the English court at London.⁶⁸ Moreover, the document indirectly resulted in a fearful ordeal of blood for the English Catholics, in which the heroism of martyrs purified and rejuvenated their Catholic faith.⁶⁹

Lepanto

More positive and tangible in results, though not marked by greater zeal or purity of intention, were the successful exertions of the saintly Pontiff to crush the oriental threat from the Turks. The Holy League, made up of the Papal States, Venice and Spain, and the battle of *Lepanto* which the League won became, from the very day of the victory, the most popular and best known claim of Pius the Fifth to glory.⁷⁰

⁵⁹ Texts in Pastor, VIII, 447-451; Merriman, *op. cit.*, 293.

⁶⁰ Cf. Hergenröther, *Katholische Kirche und christlicher Staat in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung*, Freiburg, 1872, 679 ff.

⁶¹ Cf. Schnürer, *op. cit.*, 475; Pastor, VIII, 443.

⁶² This question has been studied recently by H. Rommen, *Die Staatslehre des Franz Suarez*. (München Gladbach. 1927), 149 ff. and *Der Staat in der katholischen Gedankenwelt* (Paderborn. 1935), 200 ff.; cf. also Schnürer, *op. cit.*, 173, 749 ff.

⁶³ *Ibid.*, 476 ff.; Pastor, IX, 286 ff.

⁷⁰ Cf. Guido Antonio Quarti, *La battaglia de Lepanto nei canti popolari dell' Epoca* (Milano. 1930).

⁵⁹ Pastor, *loc. cit.*, 452.

⁶⁰ Text in Serrano, III, 308.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, 291.

⁶² Pastor, VIII, 442.

⁶³ *Ibid.*, 440; Merriman, *op. cit.*, 292-293.

⁶⁴ Documents in Serrano, III, 291, 308, 396.

Today a critical examination of the documents bearing on the subject reveals quite clearly the mistaken conclusions of the older historical chroniclers. In truth the victory of Lepanto cannot be regarded purely as a "miracle" wrought at the intercession and prayer of the Pope. Even in the sixteenth century, the Spanish historian, Cabrera de Cordova, wrote of the so-called miracle in an ironical vein: "Some maintained that the victory of Lepanto was miraculous because the Turks were reported to have seen angels with drawn swords above the Christian galleys, as depicted in the painting that today adorns a wall in the Vatican. But the result of the battle in which 10,000 Christians perished, would seem to imply that the angels of Lepanto were not nearly as courageous as the solitary heavenly messenger of the Old Testament who, in a single night, slew 185,000 Assyrians."⁷¹

Assuredly the battle of Lepanto was no miracle. Indeed it was one of the most "technical" naval engagements of all history, as the French Admiral, Jurien de Gravière, has proved in his excellent study of the battle published in 1888.⁷² In more recent years, the conclusions of Admiral Jurien were confirmed by an international flotilla which studied the various phases and maneuvers of the historic battle, in the Gulf of Lepanto itself. But despite the fact that the victory of Lepanto cannot be accurately termed miraculous, it still remains true that the proponent and mainspring of the enterprise was Saint Pius the Fifth.

It was his perseverance and consummate skill that united, at least for the necessary span of months, the ambitions of Venice in the "eastern" Mediterranean with the interests of Spain in the "western" part of the same sea. And the candidature of Don Juan of Austria as the man best fitted to command the expedition, was resolutely urged by Pius the Fifth. For the Pope was aware that Don Juan was the only leader capable of mollifying the mutual suspicions and arrogance of the League's rival members, Spain and Venice. Moreover the prestige that the Pontiff enjoyed with Philip II provided the basic reason why Philip II finally assented to the appointment of Marco Antonio Colonna, leader of the Papal forces, as Lieutenant General to Don Juan, instead of the appointment of a Spaniard to this post, as he had originally insisted upon. And it was due more to Pius the Fifth's efforts, than to those of the Venetians and even Don Juan himself, that the "prudent" reservations of Requesens and Doria in not wishing to stake everything on one battle, were ultimately overcome. Finally the penances and prayers of Pius the Fifth, together with his unshakable trust in winning the victory, resulted in the conviction among his contemporaries that the success of the battle was due to him.

Castagna, the Papal Nuncio at Madrid, reported the impression that the victory had made on the Spanish court in the following fashion: "Some of the leading nobles of the Royal Council are of the opinion that, in seeking out the Turkish fleet within the shadow of its own citadel, with the season of the year so far advanced, and with

forces inferior to those of the adversary, Don Juan was displaying a resolution so hazardous, not to say rash, that as a result he could, naturally speaking, hope for nothing more than complete failure. In view of these reasons the nobles affirm that it was *only the prayers of the Pope which moved God to grant the Christians the victory*. From these facts it can easily be gathered, that if one of these elderly and cautious courtiers had been named captain-general of the armada, nothing at all would ever have been accomplished. Notwithstanding all this, the nobles are high in their praise of Don Juan's valor; his reputation and prestige have grown by leaps and bounds. The king, for his own part, speaks of Don Juan with tender affection."⁷³ Indeed history has linked the name of Pius the Fifth with that of the youthful hero for all time. In a letter to Philip II referring to Don Juan, the Pontiff wrote that he was superior in heroism and daring courage "to every Admiral that has been known since the coming of Christ."⁷⁴

At the Tomb of the Pope

Perhaps the reader will have observed that neither in the title nor in the course of this study have we referred to Saint Pius the Fifth as the Pope of the "Counter-Reformation." The reason is that, as we maintain, there never was a "Counter-Reformation," but rather a "Catholic restoration."

Mr. Evennett has very accurately pointed out that the chief objection to the use of the term "Counter-Reformation" (as little satisfactory as the generic term "Reformation") is that such a terminology suggests a "disastrous over-simplification" of the problem, i. e., in looking on the Catholic revival as a mere reaction against the Protestant movement.⁷⁵ We may add, as our own personal opinion, that the danger of this "over-simplification" is all the greater, since the terminology "Counter-Reformation" has passed into written history under the leadership of Protestants, principally as a result of the influence of Leopold von Ranke.⁷⁶

The Catholic Restoration of the sixteenth century, in which Pius the Fifth had the leading rôle, is far removed from being a mere anti-Protestant reaction. Every aspect of the Pontiff's character, all of his activities, his co-workers—nay more, even the difficulties themselves which we have analyzed in this paper—all trace their origin back to sources that were either anterior to the Lutheran revolt or were substantially independent of it. The attacks of Luther and Calvin indeed had this much effect: they modified the procedure of Catholic restoration. But in all truth they did not give rise to the movement, nor do their assaults explain the history of the movement. It was a Restoration that was born of the internal strength of the Church and not imposed on it by outside forces.

The nascent baroque art of Rome at this time might be said, in some ways, to express this movement of resto-

⁷³ Text in Serrano, *España en Lepanto*, 186.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, 164.

⁷⁵ Evennett, *op. cit.*, 465-466.

⁷⁶ Cf. Alb. Elkan, "Entstehung und Entwicklung des Begriffs, Gegenreformation" in *Historische Zeitschrift*, 112 (1914), 480 ff. Schnürer, *op. cit.*, 274, contends that the term Counter-Reformation is more easily explained, more acceptable in reference to Germany. Applied to the whole Church, the expression is unfortunate and misleading.

⁷¹ Text in Serrano, *España en Lepanto* (Barcelona. 1935), 195.

⁷² Jurien de la Gravière, *La guerre de Chypre et la bataille de Lépanie* (Paris. 1888).

ration. It was this type of art that was employed in building the Chapel of the Sacrament in the Church of St. Mary Major, wherein are interred the mortal remains of the great Pope of the Catholic Restoration.

This remarkable artistic work was wrought by the genius of Dominico Fontana at the behest of Pope Sixtus V.⁷⁷ Herein was placed a statue of the saintly Pontiff which faces towards the tabernacle of the Sacrament, erected in the center of the chapel. The tabernacle itself, the work of Orazio Torregiani, is supported by four angels in the guise of beautiful youths. The whole effect of this portrayal is symbolic of the Pope's life. For Jesus Christ in the Blessed Sacrament was the inspiration and soul of all the activities of Pius the Fifth.

Beneath the tabernacle and altar of the Blessed Sacrament, in a crypt that is only partially exposed to view, Fontana placed the old altar and the ancient relics of the Holy Manger. In thus ordering that these precious relics, so intimately associated with medieval piety towards the Blessed Mother and the Incarnate Word, be placed in

the chapel of the Holy Sacrament, Pope Sixtus V would seem to have intended to bring out in bold relief all their implicit symbolism.

The altar of the Holy Manger suggests still more. For on this altar two saints, whose lives are emblematic of the transition from the Church of the fifteenth century to the Catholic Restoration of the sixteenth, celebrated their first Masses—Saint Cajetan of Thiene in 1514 and Saint Ignatius Loyola in 1538.⁷⁸ This symbolism surrounding the tomb of the Pope offers a clearer understanding of the real Saint Pius the Fifth. Commencing with two saints who witnessed the first incursions of Protestantism, we are transported back through the medieval ages of faith and piety to the Last Supper and the institution of the Holy Eucharist.

⁷⁸ With regard to St. Cajetan this is common knowledge, vouched for by the tablet still preserved in the chapel. There is less evidence for St. Ignatius, but the fact is certain. The saint himself has left the record in an autograph letter to his brother, Don Martin de Loyola. Cf. Dionisio Fernandez Zapico, S. J., "La carta de S. Ignacio sobre su primera Misa" in *AHSI*, I (1932), 100-104.

William of Warenne, a Cluny Patron

Herbert H. Coulson

St. Louis University

THE Norman conquest of England in 1066 has been regarded by historians as in many ways an advantage to England, in others a catastrophe. To some historians the development of a cultural relationship between England and Normandy in the reign of Edward the Confessor, and the culmination of that development in the advent of William mark the end of an evolutionary process that showed promise of an interesting national growth cut off from the main stream of continental civilization. For these historians the Norman period is marked by an intellectual stagnation and the stultification of all that was good in the first half of the eleventh century. To others the Conquest was a boon that gave to England the benefits which were being showered on Western Europe by Normandy. These historians point to the more highly centralized and more efficient government that William introduced, to the erection of magnificent cathedrals and to the arrival in England of such learned men as Lanfranc and St. Anselm.

There seems to be no doubt that the invasion of England was undertaken with a special obligation to reform the Church. Churchmen, both scholars and administrators, followed in the wake of the invading forces and were given responsible positions in both Church and state. Dioceses were organized more efficiently; Church estates were better administered; Church courts, independent of secular control or interference, were established; and cathedrals and abbeys began to dot the face of the land.

Despite the example of men like St. Wulfstan of Worcester monasticism seems to have fallen on evil days just prior to the arrival of the Normans. Pignot, after instancing the flourishing foundations of Glastonbury, Ramsey, Peterborough, Thorney, Ely, Croyland, Abingdon

and Canterbury, says that the Danish invasions

... stifled this work almost at birth. The ruin or impoverishment of the churches entailed disorder and ignorance among the clergy and this in turn affected the rest of the population. The life of the monks scarcely differed from that of the laity. They wore worldly clothing, consumed all kinds of food, gave themselves up to usurious practices, to debauchery and the most shameful breaches of faith . . .¹

All this is very reminiscent of the state of affairs just prior to the inception of the Cluny reform in France.

William the Conqueror was not negligent in the matter of monastic reform. While, with the exception of Battle Abbey, he seems to have done little in the way of founding monasteries himself, he very early in his reign opened up friendly relations with Cluny, seeking and obtaining the privilege of sharing in the prayers and good works of the monks. He failed, however, to obtain six monks from Cluny whose services he desired as advisers. Though the king offered to pay one hundred pounds of silver for each of them Abbot Hugh was not sure that conditions in England would be good for his men. From that time the king ceased to have any direct intercourse with Cluny. Nevertheless he did not prevent his barons from establishing monastic houses, and he does not appear to have had any objections to their entering into friendly relations with Cluny. Hence we find William of Warenne and his wife, Gundrada, the daughter of Matilda of Flanders, serving in the capacity of patrons and pioneers for the Cluniac order on English soil.

William of Warenne took his name from Varenne, today Bellencombre, in Haute Normandie. He was descended from Richard I, Duke of the Normans. In 1054 he was present as a knight at the battle of Mortemer and was afterwards given the castle of Mortemer. Twelve

¹ J. H. Pignot, *Histoire de l'ordre de Cluny*, II, 296.

years later he was at Hastings and was rewarded for his services to William with one-sixth of the county of Sussex and the town of Lewes.²

After Hastings the Anglo-Saxons still continued to resist but their efforts were not coordinated, and William of Warenne took an active part in rounding up Hereward, "the last of the English," in the fens of Ely. William had a special grudge against Hereward for the slaying of his brother Frederic, but though Hereward's forces were captured their romantic leader escaped.

In 1074 while Warenne was acting as justiciar Ralph, Earl of Norfolk, and Roger, Earl of Hereford, plotted a rebellion and invited Waltheof, the only remaining powerful Saxon noble, to join them. The indecision of Waltheof, who conveyed information of some of the preliminary negotiations to Archbishop Lanfranc, resulted in the defeat of the rebels. It was shortly after this affair that William of Warenne and Gundrada set out on their famous pilgrimage to Rome.

The account of their journey is included in the foundation charter of Lewes Priory.³ William and his wife visited many monasteries in France and Burgundy for the purpose of prayer. On arriving in Burgundy they were unable to proceed on account of the strife between the Emperor Henry IV and Pope Gregory VII. Then, says the account, "we turned aside to Cluny," a large and ancient abbey built in honor of St. Peter. There the two pilgrims stayed, especially addressing their prayers to St. Peter, whose tomb they had intended to visit, to whom this monastery of Cluny was dedicated, and who, incidentally, was the patron saint of England at that time.

Many witnesses have testified to the holiness of Cluniac life. It was a place of "many Pauls and many Antonies" according to one anonymous visitor of the previous decade: but it was left to William in a dry legal document to write the most succinct and moving description of the condition of religion there.

And because we found holiness and discipline (*religio*) and such great charity there, and because there was honor shown to us by the good prior and the whole community which received us into their society and fraternity (i. e., for sharing in their prayers and good works) we began to have love and devotion towards that house and that order above all other houses that we saw.⁴

William then admits that, for their sins, he and his wife had for some time past planned to make a new foundation at Lewes and that they had been confirmed in their resolution by Archbishop Lanfranc. But Abbot Hugh was not at Cluny at the time. Giving up their Italian project therefore, the two pilgrims returned to England and wrote to Hugh asking for "two or three or four monks" and promising to give them a church of wood and stone, below the castle of Lewes, which had been built in honor of St. Pancras in ancient times. They further promised to grant sufficient land, animals, and goods to support twelve monks, the usual number in establishing a new foundation in medieval times.

But Abbot Hugh was unwilling to send his monks across the sea where conditions were not too stable. If

Warenne could obtain a charter from King William, however, permitting the creation of the new house in free alms, Hugh agreed to send the monks. The king granted the confirmation and Prior Lanzo was sent to England with three of the brethren. In token of the connection between Lewes and Cluny fifty shillings were to be sent annually to the mother house, and William agreed that none but Cluniacs should rule the new priory.

Prior Lanzo ruled for thirty years, and St. Pancras became the parent foundation for a number of new houses. William of Malmesbury testifies that no monastery excelled Lewes in the good lives of the monks, in hospitality to guests, and in charity to all.

William, mortally wounded at the siege of Pevensey, died in 1088. His wife, Gundrada, had preceded him, and both were buried in the Priory church. Their bones were discovered in 1845 and re-interred at Southover.

It is true that Cluniac influence had been felt in England before the days of William. The English Customary, drawn up in the reign of King Edgar and sanctioned at the Council of Winchester, shows, says Rose Graham, "a singular agreement with Cluniac customs, which were adopted indirectly through Fleury."⁵ In William's own day Lanfranc wrote for the guidance of the prior of the cathedral monastery at Canterbury monastic constitutions which are "with the exception of a few trifling additions . . . a much abridged version of the Customs of Bernard," and the first chapter of these constitutions is based not merely on the Customs of Bernard but also on "the earlier Customs of the time of Abbot Odilo, and Customs of the tenth century."⁶ But Cluny reform depended on Cluny control and the credit for founding the first Cluniac priory in England must be given to the layman, William of Warenne.

⁵ Rose Graham, *English Ecclesiastical Studies*, 7.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 8.

Our Book Review section is expanding. And we have been cheered by words of encouragement from readers who are competent to judge its value. On the whole, the books we accept for review are such as should interest a majority of our subscribers. This does not mean, of course, that all are recommended unreservedly. It does mean that our selection is well above the average of the book market. We hope, also, that each review will contain some thought for the reader who may never see the book itself.

Our greatest regret as we send our final proof for this issue to the printer is the delayed publication of Father L. J. Kenny's "Americana" page, which arrived just too late. The BULLETIN would like to be among the first to announce *Some LaSalle Journeys*, by Jean Delanglez. This publication of the "Institute of Jesuit History" mercilessly tears away the rank overgrowth of legend and romance with which LaSalle's ballyhooing press agents, meaning chiefly Pierre Margry, have obscured important facts. Another volume which deserves an early notice is Clavigero's *History of (Lower) California*, published for the first time in English by the Stanford University Press.

Incidentally, had space permitted, at least nine University Presses would be represented among our reviews.

² *Dictionary of National Biography*, LIX, 372-373.

³ Sir G. F. Duckett, *Record Evidences Among Archives of Ancient Abbey of Cluni*, 33-34.

⁴ *Ibid.*

Book Reviews

Towards the Twentieth Century, by H. V. Routh. New York. The Macmillan Company. 1937. pp. x + 392. \$3.50.

Anyone who has ever allowed himself to stray into an unknown quarter of a metropolis like London or Paris merely for the absurd and exciting fun of finding his way back home without help or guidance should be able to appreciate the labyrinthine wanderings of many of our nineteenth century "thinkers." It would, perhaps, be too strong a comparison and a mixing of metaphors to liken them to the blind man in a dark room looking for an object that isn't there. But one does get the feeling that they have deliberately turned out the lights, ignored all signposts and refused to ask directions because they enjoyed the quest for truth more than the truth itself. An old impression is deepened by a rapid reading of Dr. Routh's "essays in the spiritual history of the nineteenth century." Nor is it unfortunate that the author owns a kinship of spirit with the literary men he portrays.

As a key statement we select his comment on Newman who, incidentally, "represents the first effort of Victorianism to be worthy of the heritage which the romantic movement had transmitted." Newman, he tells us, "found a spiritual kingdom which commanded the allegiance of his soul . . . Yet he missed the self-fulfillment which each age offers to its ablest sons." In other words, the failure of a literary giant consisted in finding his way back home or, if you will, in turning on the light when he might have spent half a life-time longer stumbling through the shadows. But Newman, who heads the list, is the only one among the great Victorians who (if we follow the author) failed.

The book is worth reading, though naturally we disagree with the lame philosophy of its author, and often with what may be taken as statements of fact. We do not think, to choose a random example, that "Darwin, Huxley and Haeckel explain man's relation to the Universe." On the other hand, we agree that "what the twentieth century lacks is spiritual certainty," that there is "no undercurrent of intellectual and emotional earnestness . . . No unity of mood amid all the diversities of opinion." More to the point, "our mechanical, commercial age narrows and represses humanity, intensifies our animal egoisms and makes us despise the spiritual values which our fathers bequeathed us." *Towards the Twentieth Century* helps to explain a sad story.

R. CORRIGAN.

The Marcus W. Jernegan Essays in American Historiography, by his former students. Edited by William T. Hutchinson. University of Chicago Press. 1937. pp. x + 417. \$4.00.

Medieval and Historiographical Essays in Honor of James Westfall Thompson, by his former students. Edited by James Lea Cate and Eugene N. Anderson. University of Chicago Press. 1938. pp. x + 499. \$4.50.

Historians are usually a progressive lot. But with the publication within the last year or so of several studies on historiography, they seem to be retracing their steps, perhaps to give an account of themselves. The Jernegan volume deserves a top-ranking position as a handy supplement in this recent development of American historiography. It is a happy coincidence that these twenty-one essays of almost equal merit penned by his former students at Chicago University, should be dedicated to one who himself was among the first in our American colleges to attain notable success in seminars on historiography. Perhaps Professor Jernegan will not be inscribed in the historians' hall of fame, but his merit as teacher and guide to budding researchers is worthy of this testimonial.

The *Essays* do not offer a complete nor unified history of American history. The end in view has been to select certain leading types, and to examine their chief works for the purpose of ascertaining their methods of research and the influences determining their outlook upon the past. The leaders chosen are: George Bancroft, Hildreth, Parkman, von Holst, Schouler, Woodrow Wilson, McMaster, Fiske, Rhodes, Henry Adams, Mahan, Roosevelt, Turner, Osgood, Channing, George Beer, Alvord, Van Tyne, Ulrich Phillips, Beveridge and Parrington. By following a single definite pattern the authors have blended a certain unity into the whole. After a short biography of the man follows a criticism of his most important works and an evaluation of his contribution to the progress of American his-

torical writing. In their own day, each of the pioneer volumes suffered slanted criticisms at the hands of their reviewers, some justified, others not; and should these essays do no more than re-evaluate their merit, they would be a creditable addition to critical historical scholarship. Both for the professional historian and the casual reader the volume will be found interesting, instructive and easy to read.

In contrast to this volume the Thompson *Essays* contain a garden variety of subjects. The only bond of unity is one of affection and esteem which the writers manifest for their scholarly master. However the *Essays* do evolve around the two general fields into which Professor Thompson had dipped his voluminous and slightly erratic pen—the history of the Middle Ages and the history of historical scholarship. The thirteen Medieval essays include topics in political, ecclesiastical, social, economic and cultural history; the four excursions into the field of historiography are devoted to Medieval, modern European and American history. In a brief notice of this type it is impossible to give an adequate estimate of the volume. However Professor Anderson's essay on the crisis in historical thought, although written in a muddy style, due in some measure to his subject matter, deserves the historian's attention. It is a warning signal to stop and ask ourselves just why we are studying and writing history. Both volumes are a credit to their editors and publishers, and serve as a fine cross-section to the student's reference shelf.

GEORGE MCHUGH.

The Study of International Relations in the United States: Survey for 1937, by Edith E. Ware. Published for the American National Committee on International Intellectual Cooperation. Columbia University Press. New York. 1938.

Surveys are like statistics; they tell the story their editors want to portray. Dr. Ware has done little interpretation for the readers of her survey. She presents many names and figures of educational, research, social, cultural and religious organizations interested in international relations. The work of each group is summarily described to acquaint the novice with the myriad organizations whose work lies in the field of international relations or borders upon it. The author's conclusion is simple: there are many groups in the United States interested in our international problems. For these the book will serve as a handy guide.

As we have already hinted the chief defect of this study is its failure to portray adequately the real nature of many of the different groups. Whether we like it or not, among these many organizations there are some whose origins and aims are not consistent with the fostering of true peace and international relations. We do not have to be ultra-conservativist to label these groups as Communistic. Their pleas for international peace are based on a philosophy of government that is little in harmony with American principles and traditions. They should be uncovered as often as they seek to propagate their camouflaged doctrines.

We note a comparative sparsity in treatment of Catholic activity due, we feel, not to the author, but rather to the failure of Catholic groups to provide a satisfactory record of their activities.

BRIAN A. McGRATH.

The Organization of the English Customs System, 1696-1786, by Elizabeth Evelynola Hoon. Appleton-Century Company, Inc. New York. 1938. pp. ix + 322. \$4.00.

The English customs system of the eighteenth century, with special emphasis on the methods employed in evading its enforcement officers, has played no small part in romance and legend. This extremely well-documented work deals with the "nature of the organization actually responsible for the working of the system." The dates delimiting the period, while of little significance in political history, are important land-marks in the economic development of England, 1696 marking the establishment of the Board of Trade and Plantations and the creation of the Inspector General of Imports and Exports, and 1786 being the last year of the eighteenth century system prior to Pitt's Consolidation Act. The book explains among other things the organization of the customs service, the functions of the in-

numerable officials of the various controlling agencies, the management of the Port of London and other ports of entry, and the manner of collecting customs. Inefficiency, dishonesty, cumbersome machinery, and the evil results of political patronage are disclosed on nearly every page. A perusal of the section entitled "Procedure at Importation" (pp. 245-254), leaves one wondering how a ship ever succeeded in landing its cargo at all. The endless confusion of the Port of London is well described in the account of the "Long Room at the London Custom House" and the procedure followed there (pp. 128-132). There are descriptions of the fate of damaged tobacco (p. 155), of the inability of Liverpool to collect customs through the absence of the political patron and his consequent failure to nominate a deputy controller for the port, of the involved method pursued in securing military aid in the enforcement of the law (p. 89), and of the hopeless state of confusion in the River Thames (p. 124). It is amusing to read that when smugglers at Swansea wished to land a cargo they had the enforcement officers subpoenaed for jury service so that the coast would literally be clear. The book abounds with curious names like land-waiters, tide-waiters, jerquers, short-traders, Hambro'-boats, Piazza Men, Coal Collectors and the Collector-Inwards, and it gives a vivid portrayal of sea-port life that is redolent of tar, hemp, and stale sea-water. It is a book to know about for understanding the eighteenth century. Miss Hoon has made a splendid contribution to English Economic History.

H. H. COULSON.

The History of Historical Writing, by Harry Elmer Barnes. Norman. Oklahoma University Press. pp. xiii + 434. \$3.50.

It happens now and then that a private library is thrown on the market. It will contain along with much worthless trash and books that are positively bad, a fair portion of rare and valuable tomes, a thousand volumes, say, at a dollar apiece. It may be a good investment, and buyers will be readily found. This just about states the case for Harry Elmer Barnes' new history of history, "the first of its kind in any language." The prolific Mr. Barnes is not deterred by a task that few would attempt. With immense erudition, an effective method of assembling data, a facile pen and no visible betrayal of academic modesty he pronounces categorical and final judgment on all the historians of all the ages. We cannot forbear adapting a typical criticism of Spengler which seems to fit Barnes himself: "The pompous pedantry and the showy but superficial erudition bear along an underlying philosophy . . ."

For the judicious reader, this book is worth its price. It is easy to read; it is a mine of otherwise scarcely available information; it is provocative of thought; it provides topics for endless discussion. But it is far from flawless. For the author, Christianity is merely a sect, and belief in the supernatural an outmoded superstition. Man is an animal, and human life is a riddle of minor importance which Mr. Barnes has not yet had time to solve in his usual summary way. Agnostic, benevolent atheist like his idol, James Harvey Robinson, and of course dogmatic in all his utterances, this smart sophomore is at times unconsciously blasphemous. If this review is bewildering, the reader may take it as a reflection of the state of mind produced by *The History of Historical Writing*.

R. CORRIGAN.

The United States and the Disruption of the Spanish Empire, 1810-1822, by Charles Carroll Griffin. Columbia University Press. 1937. pp. 315.

Two questions of prime importance faced the Spanish and American diplomats of this period. The first was the treaty negotiations concerning, primarily, the placement of the United States' boundaries. The other was the question of the recognition of the rebellious South American countries. Both of these closely interwoven problems vitally affected the Spanish empire in America.

The complicated relations of the United States with Spain and with Spain's rebellious colonies, the diversity of domestic opinion on these questions, the signing and delayed ratification of the Adams-Onís treaty and the recognition of the South American governments form the substance of the narrative.

The author portrays with much clarity and objectivity the story of United States' aggrandizement at Spain's expense in Florida and elsewhere, the aid given to rebel privateers and filibusters by Americans, paradoxically accused of "over-neutrality," the fiery espousal of the rebels' cause by Henry Clay, and the calm, determined plan of the legal-minded Adams, resulting in the final peaceful settlement of the problems.

In the same fair objective spirit he points out the exasperating dilatoriness of Spain's oft-changed foreign ministers and the diplomatic policies of the Spanish representatives in the United States.

The author has made use of a great number of sources; original documents, diplomatic correspondence, private letters, memoirs and newspaper articles. These latter are valuable since they give the contemporary popular view of the situation. The numerous footnotes and the considerable bibliography give a fine scholarly finesse to the clear presentation of the problem.

MARTIN HASTING.

The Movement for the Acquisition of All Mexico, 1846-1848, by John Douglas Pitts Fuller. The Johns Hopkins Press. Baltimore. 1936. pp. 174. \$1.50.

This study deals with the movement for the absorption of all Mexico which became a force to be reckoned with in the United States during the latter part of the Mexican War. The author was apparently inspired by Edward G. Bourne's twelve page essay on this subject published in the *Annual Report* of the American Historical Association for 1899. Since that article appeared no effort had been made to make a comprehensive study of the question until 1934 when Fuller published a summary of his findings in the *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*. The present study is an expansion of this summary. It is a very thorough and scholarly contribution, and because it treats in great detail a very specialized subject, it will probably remain the standard account for a long time.

As the author indicates, the movement for the absorption of Mexico did not find its origin in the war itself, but was a phase of the rather widespread sentiment of expansion that existed in the west for some sixty years previously. This strong sentiment of expansion that existed in the United States in 1896, the author concludes, was characterized not only by hypocrisy and sordidness, but also by sincerity and idealism.

The study is divided into five chapters: Background, Emergence, Growth, Disappearance, Conclusion. The sectional controversy is brought into its proper relationship, and the traditional erroneous charge that the slavocracy conspired to precipitate the Mexican War in order to extend the area of slavery is treated fully in all of its aspects for the first time. This alone gives real value to the study. In conclusion the author finds that among the causes for the failure of this country to annex all of Mexico in 1848, lack of time for expansionist sentiment to develop was probably the most important, the actions of Trist and Calhoun, whatever the motive of their actions may have been, being largely responsible.

J. MANUEL ESPINOSA.

The Jesuit Code of Liberal Education, by Allan P. Farrell, S. J., Ph. D. Milwaukee. Bruce Publishing Company. 1938. pp. xviii + 478. \$4.50.

It is a rare experience to meet a book like this. In his preface, the author sets for himself and his work a high purpose, and he does not disappoint us in its execution. His purpose is "to reconstruct from primary sources the history of the gradual process of forming the Ratio Studiorum and to make clear its original scope and its present possibilities in relation to education in this country." Very wisely, Father Farrell sets limits to so large a subject. Although the Ratio outlined a threefold curriculum, namely, the theological, philosophical, and humanistic, only the latter is here studied exhaustively; the others are discussed only in so far as they shed light on the problems peculiar to the history of the Ratio.

The result of the author's seven years of research, much of which was spent in consulting the primary and often unpublished sources of European libraries and archives, is a well-documented, authoritative, carefully-planned study of the scope and development of the Ratio Studiorum, or "Jesuit Code of Liberal Education." Particular stress is laid upon the practical wisdom that went into each successive revision of the Ratio, in virtue of which the spirit and method of this educational monument remain unchanged, though its curricular regulation may, with the passage of time, become outmoded.

The last part of the work, treating of the "Ratio Studiorum and Contemporary Education," will be of special interest to all who are anxious for guidance in our present-day educational confusion. Father Farrell asks and offers a partial answer to the question: Can we look to the Ratio Studiorum to provide us with "the basis for a new synthesis which would reflect an unchanging philosophy of education while taking cognizance of the

accumulated pedagogical wisdom of the ages since the original Ratio was drafted?"

The preface was written by the international authority on the Ratio Studiorum, the Reverend Thomas Corcoran, S. J., Head of the Department of Education in University College, Dublin, under whose direction Father Farrell pursued his doctorate studies. There are several illustrations of original manuscript extracts, and three interesting appendices, together with a complete and carefully-edited bibliography. THOMAS M. HARVEY.

The Story of Instruction, by Ernest Carroll Moore. New York. Macmillan Company. 1938. pp. ix + 575. \$4.00.

Will Durant with his *Story of Philosophy* started a fad in the writing of history which has been adopted with mediocre success by a number of writers lacking his keen imagination and popular pen. Dr. Moore in the *Story of Instruction* seems to have attempted the same approach in the field of education by trying to tell the story of sixteen centuries of teaching in the scant compass of less than six hundred pages. The result is sketchy, sinning both in lacunae and in faulty perspective.

Evidently Dr. Moore reads on the run, and writes in much the same manner. His occasional foray into theology, and his flyer into the methodology of Arabic schools want the studious criticism of the research expert. Likewise faulty is his historical comment on the founding of the Christian Church, depending as it does on such unsavory sources as Renan, Harnack, and Paul Elmer More. We are astounded to learn that the early Church "was engaged in converting men to Judaism rather than away from it," that James of Jerusalem was not even a Christian, that the Apostles did not believe in the divinity of Christ.

No one can read a book of this kind without differing from every other reader, and especially from the author, regarding both emphasis and omission. In the matter of teaching how could Charlemagne (who probably read poorly and wrote not at all) earn more space than Alcuin or John Scotus Erigena, or Gerbert be given more importance than St. Anselm? Abelard is an interesting personage certainly, but Bernard, Thomas of Aquin, Albert, and several others are of more importance in the history of instruction.

In latter chapters of the book emphasis is placed on Luther and Loyola, who as educators were of much less importance in the reviewer's opinion than their followers, Melancthon after Luther, and Acquaviva after Loyola. Factual errors occur in spots, as the birthdate of Ignatius Loyola, given two years before his time.

The book, however, has its merits, if the reader can see through the eyes of the author, and is willing to consider the work as a cursory glance at the high spots in the development of thought and not as a careful and critical study of the history of education. JOSEPH H. FICHTER.

Life and Work of Mother Benedicta Bauer, by Sister Mary Hortense Kohler, O. P. The Bruce Publishing Company. Milwaukee. 1937. pp. xv + 356.

There is romance in the Church. There is romance in the story of the great missionary saints, Paul, Augustine, and Boniface, Xavier and Jogues, whose titanic labors expanded the frontier of Christianity. Sharing the same spirit, intrepid, ardent, romantic, Mother Benedicta did a like work on a more modest stage. Sister Mary Hortense tells the story of a Dominican contribution to Catholic culture in Wisconsin, Illinois and Iowa. Beginning amid trials, hardships and privations eighty years ago, the Congregation builds quietly and solidly in America. Its origins are linked with its centuries-old convent in Regensburg, its German home-land, around which cling the memories of medieval saints and Carolingian emperors. In the long life of the Church it is easy to associate the pious women who banded together to pray for the success of Crusading armies with the daughters of St. Dominic, who, in twelve independent congregations, owe their origin to the Regensburg convent of the Holy Cross.

One thing, however, we miss in this book. It could easily have been made a more colorful biography of Mother Benedicta. But the personality of this heroic foundress is all but lost in the wealth of detail given to historical events not always directly connected with her life and work. This may be due to the fact that the story grew out of a thesis originally presented for a graduate degree. While the requirements of an examining board may reassure the reader as to scholarly workmanship, they may also militate against enthusiasm and personal appeal on the part of a writer. BERNARD J. MONKS.

Introduction to Comparative Government, by Frederick F. Blachly and Miriam E. Oatman. New York. The Ronald Press. 1938. pp. x + 465. \$3.50.

The purpose of this text book is to place old facts in a new order. Instead of the horizontal approach which compares each government as a whole, the authors use the topical approach, comparing and contrasting side by side the different solutions to the various problems of the legislative, judicial and executive branches of government. This method facilitates easy analysis and comparison, and, say the authors, provides the students with a greater stimulus for outside reading. The result should be more intelligent questioning and discussions and greater contact between teacher and student.

As with all text books much depends on the teacher's use of them, too often success gained by the skill and tact of the teacher is attributed to the type of text book or to the notes he may furnish. To the present reviewer sufficient emphasis is not placed in this text on the natural growth and development of certain forms of government to fit the needs of a given people. Again, the student gets no unified grasp of any one government, with the resulting danger of confusion in collating his matter. The stimulus to intelligent discussion and question might be attained by making the student analyze under competent direction the factors and forms that have contributed to development.

The content of this work is generally good. Democracy is placed in its true light. Its faults are not spared, nor its virtues minimized. Totalitarianism is subjected to a searching analysis, and the differences between the written constitution and actual practices of some of these governments are pointed out in no uncertain terms. Still one cannot be fully satisfied. We do not like to hear the American philosophy of government called "pure Locke." The natural basis of the state and of law is given no mention; there is no criticism of the Marxian theory of value, and the influence of Roman Law in America is passed over. The book would be greatly improved by suggested reading arranged at the end of the chapters or a bibliography at the end of the book. BRIAN A. McGRATH.

Sources of English Constitutional History, by Carl Stephenson and Frederick G. Marcham. New York. Harper and Brothers. 1937. pp. 906 + xxxiv.

The study of English constitutional history has always held a strange fascination for American scholars and the teaching of the subject, especially for students intending to follow a legal career, forms part of the curriculum of practically every American university. Such collections as those of Stubbs, Prothero, Gardiner or Robertson satisfactorily cover special periods. This is the first attempt to include documents from Aethelberht of Kent to George VI. As the general editor of the series says in a *Foreword* "it is a long story from the days when kings initiated self-government by royal command . . . to the day when an abdicating king . . . summed up the intervening centuries . . . 'Until now it has not been constitutionally possible for me to speak.'"

The documents are divided chronologically into fourteen sections, each section being subdivided, not according to any common plan but as the creation or development of new institutions seems to demand. Mostly, the documents are of an "official" nature, statutes, records of parliamentary debates, judicial decisions, borough records and the like. Each section has a short introduction containing useful bibliographical aids and imparting some information about the character of the period or of the collection of documents cited. Of course, one will find that the collection does not include some favorite quotation or other. The amazing thing is that the editors have included so much. There is a list of *Saints' Days and Other Festivals* and a *General Bibliography* at the end.

In view of the prominent part now being played by the dominions in world affairs it is particularly gratifying to note the inclusion of many documents showing the development of dominion status. For obviously no study of the British constitution would be complete without some consideration being given to the relations between the Mother Country and Canada. Quotations from the Durham Report, the British North American Act, the Statute of Westminster, Moore's case and the coronation of George VI may perhaps be considered the most useful contributions of the editors to the student's understanding of what is a somewhat puzzling relationship.

The book is to be highly recommended for class-room use and for all libraries to which students who are interested in English Constitutional development have access.

HERBERT H. COULSON.

Complaint and Reform in England, 1436-1714, by William Huse Dunham and Stanley Pargellis. Oxford University Press. New York. 1938. pp. 925 + xxxv. \$4.00.

The publishers' jacket of this book asserts that "never before has there been a compilation from the writings of those pamphleteers, popularizers, and propagandists who may be said to voice the common mind of England" in the period of the English Renaissance. Their selections, say the authors, "have been taken from fly-sheets, pamphlets, tracts, and larger works which circulated among Renaissance Englishmen." In all there are fifty selections: some of these are from such well-known sources as Simon Fish, *A Supplication for the Beggars*; John Foxe, *Acts and Monuments*; and Peter Wentworth's *Speech in the House of Commons*. Others are from the works of less-well-known writers such as John Bellers, *Supplement to the Proposal for a College of Industry*, or the *Letter to Lord Fairfax* by the seventeenth century communist, Winstanley. The title of the book may be criticized as being somewhat misleading. It might rather have read *Readings in English Renaissance Ideas*, for, as the *Introduction* states, "the selections . . . were chosen as representative statements of major beliefs and convictions which drove on the men who pushed English civilization to and fro as modernism came and medievalism wore away."

The student who reads and investigates every one of these documents will have a good knowledge of the main trends of English thought from the Age of Faith to the Age of Reason though, of course, they presuppose a nodding acquaintance with the elements of English History. Undoubtedly the main function of such a compilation will be that of serving as a useful compendium from which to quote passages for the enlivening of what might otherwise be a dull lecture. There is included a very useful chronology of events together with a chart of the lives of the pamphleteers and others whose works are cited. Each document is introduced with a brief biographical note that helps in placing the extract in perspective. The illustrations are well-chosen and the accompanying notes are worthy of attention. Apart from its academic usefulness the book has an entertainment value in such sections as *A New Litany for These Times* and *The Whole Art of Chirurgery*. Students of English History should at least be aware of the existence of such a book.

H. H. COULSON.

The Unicameral Legislature, by Alvin Johnson. The University of Minnesota Press. Minneapolis. 1938. pp. 198. \$2.50.

The value of this book lies chiefly in its timeliness. It reviews the bicameral and unicameral system of legislative houses, both at home and abroad, stressing their advantages and disadvantages, together with the cost of operation of the older system when it was patently disadvantageous to the people. It gives a running commentary on the efforts of the past few years toward improvement in legislative houses and the methods whereby such improvement was to be reached. A full chapter is devoted to the single-chamber legislature of Nebraska.

The author makes no flat declaration of his attitude, but his presentation of cases stresses the unicameral as the possible way out of what may be termed the present rotten form of legislative assemblies in the various states. His examples of the cost of operation of the two systems are very striking; for instance, the assembly of Ohio in 1935 handled practically no work of value to the people and cost one and a quarter millions; the Nebraska unicameral session was reasonably successful, and cost only \$150,000.

This book is of especial value as a reference book for teachers of civics and government, chiefly because of its bibliography of books, pamphlets and articles.

D. DECKER.

History of the Church, by Joseph Lortz (translated by Edwin G. Kaiser, C. PP. S.). The Bruce Publishing Company. Milwaukee. 1938. pp. xvi + 573.

A History is not a mere chronicle of events. It should be something more than an orderly arrangement of character sketches and vivid descriptions of action or suffering. Dates, divisions into periods, summaries and classifications of causes and effects, all have their place. A study of these may provide excellent exercise for the memory, training for the mind and food for the soul. But in the present strong reaction against the over-emphasis on the once dominant von Ranke formula, *Wie es eigentlich gewesen*, historians are stressing the need for

a philosophy of history, for a penetrating into the meaning of the past.

In the volume under review we have a study of the Church that is different. At least, there has been heretofore too little writing of this kind in English. The author presents a minimum of factual data. He is chiefly concerned with interpretation, with something greater than events or movements or persons, with the all-embracing Kingdom of God among men. Call this a contribution to the philosophy of history or merely a thoughtful and thought-provoking essay in the field of history, it is in any case an easier task for the ecclesiastical historian who is at the same time a theologian than any similar study of purely human institutions could ever be. Teachers of history will find the book refreshing and helpful. And here we have in mind not so much the historian who already knows the Church as the teacher who doesn't know European civilization because he has missed the biggest thing in it. The features of the book, aside from a few minor slips, which we are tempted to criticise in a negative way are explained by the fact that the author is a German, writing presumably for his own people.

R. CORRIGAN.

Francisco Franco, by Joaquín Arrarás, tr. J. Manuel Espinosa. Bruce. Milwaukee. 1938. pp. x + 210. \$2.50.

It seldom happens that a book is better timed than this biography of Francisco Franco. The Generalissimo was a great soldier long before the polite gangsters whom the world knew as the Liberal government of Spain had brought the nation to the brink of ruin by "selling out" to the Red monster and its Anarchist allies. But most of us were all but unaware of his existence. He has since shown himself a statesman of no mean ability as well as a gentleman and a patriot whose career is an inspiration. His name is now in the headlines. A rejuvenated and inspired people look to him for leadership with every assurance that he will not fail them. In his sweeping victories religion and patriotism triumph. Spain and the Christian world are his debtors.

The crowded years of adventure and daring which raised the young Franco through all the grades of military promotion make a story that would be worth telling at any time. That story deserves a place now among the dozen or so excellent books which have appeared on the various phases of the new Spanish epic. Its title alone is enough to recommend it. The Spanish text comes to us warm from the vibrant pen of a journalist who has been close to the hero and his work. The translation has been done by an able historian who knows the language, the ideals and the spirit of the original story. If the volume betrays a hurried composition along with a few slips due to the rush of publication, we hope the interested reader will not stop to observe them.

R. CORRIGAN.

Each year we watch for the *Rapport de l'Archiviste de la Province de Québec*. Under the able direction of Pierre-Georges Roy the rich documentary treasures of early Canadian history have been made available on a steadily widening shelf of our libraries. The volume (474 pages) for 1936-1937 falls into three sections: a census of the parishes of Montréal and Trois Rivières, an inventory of the correspondence of Bishop Signay, and a continuation of the letters of the abbé de l'Isle Dieu.

* * * * *

Two text books have come to the editorial desk from Longmans, Green and Co., either of which may be an answer to the practical needs of interested teachers. We limit our comment to the remark that they are up-to-date and teachable. Their content is fully indicated by their respective titles: *Britain in World Affairs, 1783-1936*, (pp. xvi and 340), by Robert M. Rayner and W. G. T. Airey, and *Visual Outline of Latin American History* (pp. 203), Russell H. Fitzgibbon. The sketchy character of the latter would be a lame excuse for the author's very inadequate treatment of the essential rôle played by the Church.

Libraries should have, and students should know *Bibliographies in American History*, by Henry Putney Beers (W. H. Wilson, New York. 1938). In this "Guide to materials for research" with its nearly 8,000 items slight slips are inevitable. For example, the *St. Louis University Bulletin* for 1929 (Publications, 1923-1927) is listed, but not the similar and more recent *Bulletin* of 1937. Also, at least one unique bibliography, "The Church in Mid-America," by T. F. O'Connor (*HISTORICAL BULLETIN*, XIII & XIV) was missed.